National Library
of Canada

Bibliothèque nationale
du Canada

Canadian Theses Service

Service des thèses canadiennes

Ottawa, Canada
K1A 0N4

NOTICE

The quality of this microform is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original thesis submitted for microfilming. Every effort has been made to ensure the highest quality of reproduction possible.

If pages are missing, contact the university which granted the degree.

Some pages may have indistinct print especially if the original pages were typed with a poor typewriter ribbon or if the university sent us an inferior photocopy.

Previously copyrighted materials (journal articles, published tests, etc.) are not filmed.

Reproduction in full or in part of this microform is governed by the Canadian Copyright Act, R.S.C. 1970, c. C-30.

AVIS

La qualité de cette microforme dépend grandement de la qualité de la thèse soumise au microfilmage. Nous avons tout fait pour assurer une qualité supérieure de reproduction.

S'il manque des pages, veuillez communiquer avec l'université qui a conféré le grade.

La qualité d'impression de certaines pages peut laisser à désirer, surtout si les pages originales ont été dactylographiées à l'aide d'un ruban usé ou si l'université nous a fait parvenir une photocopie de qualité inférieure.

Les documents qui font déjà l'objet d'un droit d'auteur (articles de revue, tests publiés, etc.) ne sont pas microfilmés.

La reproduction, même partielle, de cette microforme est soumise à la Loi canadienne sur le droit d'auteur, SRC 1970, c. C-30.

NL-339 (r. 88/04)

Canada

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

MATTHEW ARNOLD: COMPARATIVE EDUCATOR AND CRITIC OF ENGLISH MIDDLE CLASS SOCIETY

by

©

BRENDAN ALPHONSO RAPPLE

A THESIS
SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES
AND RESEARCH IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF THE
REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY
IN
COMPARATIVE AND INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL FOUNDATIONS

EDMONTON, ALBERTA
FALL 1987

Permission has been granted to the National Library of Canada to microfilm this thesis and to lend or sell copies of the film.

The author (copyright owner) has reserved other publication rights, and neither the thesis nor extensive extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without his/her written permission.

L'autorisation a été accordée à la Bibliothèque nationale du Canada de microfilmer cette thèse et de prêter ou de vendre des exemplaires du film.

L'auteur (titulaire du droit d'auteur) se réserve les autres droits de publication; ni la thèse ni de longs extraits de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation écrite.

ISBN 0-315-41169-4

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

RELEASE FORM

NAME OF AUTHOR: BRENDAN ALPHONSO RAPPLE

TITLE OF THESIS: MATTHEW ARNOLD: COMPARATIVE EDUCATOR AND CRITIC OF ENGLISH MIDDLE CLASS SOCIETY

DEGREE: DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

YEAR THIS DEGREE GRANTED: FALL 1987

Permission is hereby granted to THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA LIBRARY to reproduce single copies of this thesis and to lend or sell such copies for private, scholarly or scientific research purposes only.

The author reserves other publication rights, and neither the thesis nor extensive extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's written permission.

(SIGNED) Brendan A. Rapple

PERMANENT ADDRESS:
12 Croydon Gardens, Fairview,
Dublin 3, Ireland.

Date: 14th Sept. 1987

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA
FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH

The undersigned certify that they have read, and recommend to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research for acceptance, a thesis entitled MATTHEW ARNOLD: COMPARATIVE EDUCATOR AND CRITIC OF ENGLISH MIDDLE CLASS SOCIETY submitted by BRENDAN ALPHONSO RAPPLE in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY in COMPARATIVE AND INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION.

D.R. Pugh
Supervisor

R. F. Anderson

H. W. [illegible]

S W Jackson
External Examiner

Date: September 14 1987

DEDICATION

TO MY PARENTS

ABSTRACT

This thesis focuses on aspects of the work of Matthew Arnold (1822-1888) in his role of comparative educator and English social critic. Arnold's views on the nature, purpose and methodology of Comparative Education are examined and note is taken of his official and unofficial visits to the Continent as a comparative educator. These visits, it is contended, convinced Arnold that England, despite her vaunted progress, was failing to meet the modern Zeitgeist as effectively as other nations, particularly France and Germany. He attributed this Continental superiority primarily to the positive role of the State in these nations, especially in regard to education; he himself developed a quite Continental notion of the State which is analysed in some detail as it provides the key to much of his thinking about English concerns. Careful attention is paid to Arnold's strictures on the English middle class whose lack of "culture" and whose rejection of State action inhibited national progress. Particular emphasis is laid upon his view of the educational deficiencies of this class who in spite of their Philistinism were for him the only possible agents of England's regeneration. Finally a lengthy discussion is provided of his prescriptions for improving middle class education through a thorough State post-elementary system modelled on those of France and Germany. For it is the thesis' fundamental argument that the transformation of Philistine society by means of a Continental-style post-elementary educational system was the dominant leitmotiv of Arnold's comparative educational work and, indeed, one of the paramount goals of his life.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I wish to thank my supervisor, Prof. D.R. Pugh, Dept. of Educational Foundations, most sincerely for his help, both on a personal and professional level, during the course of my graduate studies. His unfailing generosity of time and expertise was of immense support and contributed greatly to the successful completion of this thesis. I also express my gratitude to Dr. P.J. Miller, Dept. of Educational Foundations, and to Dr. R.F. Anderson, Dept. of English, members of my supervisory committee, who provided constructive criticisms and warm encouragement. Thanks are also due to Dr. Henry Hodysh, Dept. of Educational Foundations, and to Dr. S.W. Jackman, Dept. of History, University of Victoria, for their careful reading of the thesis and for their stimulating questions and comments during the final defence. In addition, I am very grateful to the staff of the Manuscripts Department, University of Virginia Library, who provided access to the A.K. Davis-Matthew Arnold Letter Collection, and to Dr. Cecil Lang and Ms. Beverley C. Kirsch, University of Virginia, who furnished me with typescripts of many of Matthew Arnold's unpublished letters. Furthermore, a special word of thanks goes to Mr. Hank Hoekstra and staff of the C.M.P.A., Education Library, University of Alberta, for their most capable and also very friendly assistance. My graduate studies were funded by teaching and research assistantships from the Dept. of Educational Foundations, and by a Dissertation Fellowship from the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research. This same Faculty generously supported my research at the University of Virginia. In conclusion, suffice it to say that without Simone Helluy, Dept. of Zoology, this thesis would not have been written.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter Page

I INTRODUCTION 1

A. Purpose and Scope of the Present Work 1

B. Justification for the Present Work 7

C. Limitations of the Study 10

D. Original Sources Consulted 12

E. Critical Review of the Literature on Arnold 15

(i) Works up to 1950 16

(ii) Works from 1950 to the Present 24

(iii) Works on Arnold the Comparative Critic 36

F. Outline of the Subsequent Chapters 39

References 44

II MATTHEW ARNOLD, COMPARATIVE EDUCATOR 52

A. Arnold's Interest in the Continent 52

B. Arnold on the Nature and Purposes of Comparative Study 55

C. Arnold on the Methodology of Comparative Education 66

D. Arnold's Reports on Foreign Educational Systems ... 73

(i) Arnold's _The Popular Education of France_ ... 75

(ii) Arnold's _A French Eton_ 83

(iii) Arnold's _Schools and Universities on the Continent_ 89

(iv) Arnold's _Special Report on Certain Points Connected with Elementary Education in Germany, Switzerland, and France_ 98

Chapter Page

References 102

III ARNOLD ON THE ROLE OF THE STATE IN SOCIETY 109

A. Arnold's View of the State 109

(i) Arnold: Political Philosopher or Practical Politician 109

(ii) What exactly did Arnold Understand by the State? 112

(iii) Social Change and the Need for Increased State Action 123

(iv) The "aliens"/"remnant" and the State 127

(v) Summary of Arnold's Interpretation of the State--Was He Totalitarian or Democrat? 135

B. Modernity and the State 140

(i) "...modern societies need a civil organisation which is modern." 140

(ii) What did Arnold understand by "Modern"? 142

(iii) The English lack of "Modernity" 145

(iv) State Schools an Important Agency for Effecting Modernity 153

C. Arnold on the Antagonism of the English to the Idea of the State and State-action, Particularly in the Sphere of Education 156

References 165

IV ARNOLD ON THE INFERIOR CIVILISATION OF THE ENGLISH MIDDLE CLASSES 177

A. "the civilisation of her middle class is England's capital pressing want" 177

B. Philistinism of the Middle Class 181

C. Middle Class Hebraism 203

D. Middle Class Dissent and Nonconformity 206

Chapter Page

E. The Participation of the Middle Class in the Religion of Inequality 216

F. The Association of the Middle Class with the Liberal Party 220

G. "and the conclusion is, that our middle class and its civilisation require to be transformed." ... 226

References 231

V ARNOLD ON THE INADEQUACIES OF MIDDLE CLASS EDUCATION IN ENGLAND 243

A. "Our middle classes are nearly the worst educated in the world." 243

B. Arnold on the Defects of England's Secondary Education 247

(i) Satisfaction of the English with the Existing Provision 247

(ii) Inadequate Supply of Good Secondary Schools 250

(iii) Lack of any Control and Securities in England's Secondary Schools 258

(iv) The Poor Quality of Teachers 268

(v) The Neglect of "Science" and Lack of Standardisation of Curricula and Texts 270

(vi) The Educational System and the Separation of Classes 274

C. The Defects of England's Third Level Education 280

D. "Schools in the Reign of Queen Victoria" 288

E. A Public Post-Elementary Educational System Essential for Transforming the Middle Classes 292

References 298

Chapter Page

VI ARNOLD'S PRESCRIPTIONS FOR IMPROVING SECONDARY AND HIGHER EDUCATION IN ENGLAND 307

A. Arnold's Prescriptions for Secondary School Reform 307

(i) A Minister of Education and a Higher Council 307

(ii) Balance Between Central and Local Government 312

(iii) Endowments 321

(iv) Funding 324

(v) Securities of Fitness: Inspection or Examinations? 329

(vi) Teachers 333

(vii) Curriculum 336

(viii) Need for Connexion and Coordination in England's Public Educational System 348

(ix) Public Schools 353

(x) Liverpool Collegiate School and Dulwich College 357

B. Arnold's Prescriptions for Third Level Educational Reform 359

References 373

VII CONCLUSION 383

A. Summary 383

B. Some Final Thoughts 390

(i) Arnold was "'en fin de compte' English of the English." 390

(ii) The "Culture" which was to result from a Public Educational System 394

(iii) Was Arnold a Reliable Critic? 398

Chapter Page

(iv) Arnold's Influence on the Development of England's Post-Elementary Educational System 402

References 409

SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY 411

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

A) Purpose and Scope of the Present Work

It would be easy to argue that Matthew Arnold--poet, school inspector, educationist, literary, political, social, and religious critic--should be granted the laurel as the major literary figure of the Victorian age. The unfailingly high standard which he achieved over the unusually broad spectrum of his very diverse works was equalled by no other writer of the era. Accordingly, it is not surprising that interest in him has remained consistent since his death in 1888 and it is doubtful whether any other Victorian literary figure, including John S. Mill, has been the subject of so much commentary and critical study. Moreover, it is likely that the near future will witness a further upsurge in Arnoldian studies with the advent of his centenary next year. As a contribution to these studies there is provided in the following chapters an examination of certain features of a relatively neglected aspect of this writer's work, namely his role as a comparative educator.

The main focus may be broken down into three closely related arguments: first, that Arnold's experiences on the Continent, gained during both his official and unofficial tours abroad, were most important in imbuing him with the firm belief that there existed a great disparity between, on the one hand, certain advances and progress being made in the civilisation of countries such as France and Germany and, on the other, the inadequate state of his own nation, especially as evidenced by the blatant shortcomings of English middle class society; secondly, that above all other agencies it was the State educational system in certain Continental countries, particularly at the secondary and higher levels, which was instrumental in effecting progress and in helping to inculcate a mental attitude more in touch with the exigencies of the modern age; this was in sharp contrast to the situation in England where the State throughout the nineteenth century played little part in post-elementary education and where very many of the existing educational institutions, especially the secondary schools, were anathema to Arnold; thirdly, that the most important result of his comparative educational work was the fostering of the deeply entrenched conviction that in order to arrest England's decline in a number of spheres vis-à-vis the advances of some of her Continental neighbours and to further her civilisation and progress it was essential to transform the middle class by means of the establishment of a public system of post-elementary education modelled on such foreign systems as the French or German. In short, it will be argued that the transformation of the middle class brought about by the establishment of public secondary and higher educational institutions, analogous to those abroad, for the purpose of ensuring England's progress was the major focus of Arnold's activities in comparative education and, in fact, a particularly prominent aspect of his very varied life's work.

It is stressed at the very outset that any study of Arnold's comparative educational work must make clear that his endeavours in this field were concerned with much more than the comparing and contrasting of the mere educational institutions of different nations. While this latter was important it was, in fact, only one aspect of his wider comparative criticism. His comparative work ranged over a very broad spectrum of topics of which education conceived in a narrow sense was only one. However, Arnold usually considered education in its wider meaning, that is, not as being divorced from other societal forces but as being thoroughly blended with them. Consequently, this study of Arnold's comparative educational views will treat them as being inextricably linked to and subsumed by his broader, more encompassing comparative views in general. It is also essential that a clear understanding is gained of how great a part his comparative criticism played in the formation of his general world picture and of what constituted the primary purpose underlying such criticism. As is well known, even early in Arnold's Inspectoral career he had become a bitter critic of certain features of English education. But the problems which he identified in the educational system at home were thoroughly intermeshed with what he felt to be faults in the wider English society--they were mutually dependent. Moreover, these inadequacies pervading England's educational system and the general society were placed in much sharper relief by his comparative examination of other countries. His comparative educational work, considered narrowly, revealed that some educational institutions and practices of certain foreign nations could be adopted in England to the great benefit of that country, while his wider comparative criticism showed to what very great extent the intellectual, cultural, social, and political virtues of these foreign societies had a thoroughly interdependent relationship with their educational systems. Accordingly, it will be shown that Arnold in borrowing from foreign educational practices wanted the reform of more than mere education in England. He did not simply desire changes in just the narrow institutionalized system of education; changes were also to be effected in many other spheres of society. But changing the educational system would be a major factor in transforming the wider society and in bringing England up to the same level as certain other Continental nations in such areas as culture, intellect, and education itself. At any rate, just as it is manifest that no adequate grasp of Arnold's views on England's education is possible without first relating them to his wider political and social criticism of his country, in like manner one cannot truly comprehend his comparative educational theories when they are divorced from his broader comparative criticisms of foreign nations. Therefore, it will be a consistent argument over the following chapters that his views on foreign education and his consequent proposals for the reform of England's own educational system were thoroughly intertwined with his wider views of Continental nations and of his own. His comparative educational views did not exist in isolation.

It will be contended that Arnold's comparative studies and his exposure to foreign societies were the greatest influence on the formation of his views towards his own country. In particular, his six month sojourn on the Continent in 1859 for the Newcastle Commission was seminal ~~in~~ shaping his educational and social thought. Later visits abroad, to North America as well as to Continental Europe, reinforced the notions formed in his early career. Though Arnold, perhaps better than most due to the nature of his job, saw at first hand the inadequacies and problems pervading the society in which he lived, his ability to compare and contrast them with those of foreign societies, the conditions of which he also witnessed at first hand, certainly helped to place them in sharper focus. His travels abroad made it all the more manifest just how much England was lagging behind certain of her Continental neighbours.[1] Moreover, it was from the Continent above all other sources that Arnold formed his proposals for reshaping and developing England.

It will be an important aspect of this present work to stress that the greatest problem which Arnold saw pervading English society was the insularity, provinciality, and general narrowmindedness of her population, and that he considered this to be especially evident when they were placed in juxtaposition with the citizens of such countries as Germany and France. Arnold was by no means an idolater of either of these two nations--on the contrary, he was conscious that problems were far from being absent here also. But he was invariably impressed with the intellectual awareness, the love of knowledge, the possession of "culture," the openness to new ideas, and the understanding of the modern Zeitgeist possessed by their peoples. This, he felt, was quite opposite to the situation in England where most of the people, intellectually parochial and insular, thought that their country was the acme of the world's stage and that little was to be learned from abroad. But it was above all the English middle classes, which he considered were most guilty in this respect and it was these "Philistines" who now, in mid-Victorian England, were succeeding to the forefront of the social, political, and economic scene. The middle class were increasingly England's rulers but they were also responsible for their country's falling behind certain Continental nations in many respects. England had not too long ago led the world but now she was clearly behind Germany and France, and America was rising fast. In his prolific writings Arnold turned again and again to the failings and inadequacies of the middle classes and how they were largely responsible for his country's decline vis-à-vis certain Continental nations. But if there was one reason stressed by Arnold for their unsatisfactory nature it was undoubtedly their educational institutions. In work after work he consistently criticized England's post-elementary education, and particularly its failure to provide for the needs of the modern age. He did indeed have praise for some secondary establishments, especially the great Public Schools, and also for certain aspects of the few universities, but overall he felt that middle class education at the post-elementary level was abysmal. Moreover, it was one of his most firmly held beliefs that such education was also certainly inferior to that of some foreign nations, a belief especially reinforced by his official and unofficial trips abroad.

Furthermore, the main reason, he averred, why his country's post-elementary educational institutions were falling behind some of their foreign counterparts was that they were almost totally free from State-interference. England's elementary schools, as the century progressed, came increasingly subject to State control; however, during Arnold's lifetime secondary and higher institutions remained by and large autonomous, untouched by the sort of jurisdiction to which the corresponding schools of Prussia and France were subject. Accordingly, it was a consistent recommendation of Arnold that England should look to foreign practices and enjoin the participation of the State in middle class education in order that the task of leading the country back to the forefront of modern nations might be more easily accomplished.

B) Justification for the Present Work

As has often been observed, Matthew Arnold was one of the foremost comparative critics of the nineteenth century. Indeed, in the words of Jerold J. Savory he was "the first great comparative critic to bring sympathies with remote cultures and European sensibilities into English literary and social criticism."[2] Even a brief perusal of his work will provide clear evidence of his great interest in very many aspects of foreign societies and of the corresponding concern which he manifested in attempting to illuminate his own civilization by means of his comparative criticism.

For, throughout his life he was a keen and perceptive critic of very varied features of a number of other countries--he was far from being the stereotypical insular Englishman who believed that his country alone had attained the highest levels of civilisation and that, consequently, there was little interest in the study of other societies. He paid three official and numerous unofficial visits abroad, to the U.S.A. and Canada as well as the Continent, his official trips being those undertaken as a commissioner for the Newcastle and Taunton Commissions and as an emissary for the Education Department in 1885-1886. He also wrote widely on various social, political, cultural, and religious aspects of foreign nations, for example, the Italian question of 1859, Irish political and social history, England and the Irish University debate, American culture and society, General Grant, the role of the Academy in France, among many others. Above all, he composed numerous critical essays on foreign literary figures including Emerson, Goethe, Spinoza, Maurice de Guérin, Eugénie de Guérin, George Sand, Heinrich Heine, Joubert, Sainte-Beuve, Amiel, Leo Tolstoy, Joseph de Maistre. In fact, in this sphere of comparative literary criticism Arnold was sometimes far in advance of his fellow countrymen and wrote on authors who were very little known to even the well educated in England.[3] It is just that he is so often assigned a pioneering role in the field of comparative literature.

It is equally just that Arnold is frequently recognised as playing a significant part in the history of that field of study known as comparative education, with many scholars mentioning his importance as a comparative critic in the educational sphere. For example, Nicholas Hans, considering Arnold's work for the Royal Commissions and on foreign education in general, declared that he was "the first English pioneer" of comparative education and that all subsequent work in the field was deeply influenced by his research.[4] Similarly, G.H. Bantock asserted that it is possible to regard Arnold "as a pioneer in comparative education," while Vernon Mallinson mentioned "the pioneering days" and "the valuable contribution" made by Arnold in this particular sphere of education.[5] In addition, William F. Connell stated that Arnold "was regarded as somewhat of an authority in the field of Comparative Education" while H.C. Barnard, in like manner, asserted that he "became a recognized authority on comparative education."[6] Curtis and Boultwood went further, venturing "With considerable justification one may regard him as the founder of comparative education."[7] George Z.F. Bereday in his brief review of the history of the methods of comparative education placed Arnold in the first phase, the period of "borrowing," coupling him with the likes of Victor Cousin in France, the Russians Leo Tolstoy and K. D. Ushinsky, Domingo Sarmiento in Argentina, and the Americans Horace Mann and Henry Barnard.[8] Harold J. Noah and Max A. Eckstein, in their review of the history of this field of education were in agreement with Bereday that Arnold is to be included in the phase of "educational borrowing."[9] Stewart Fraser, and Andreas M. Kazamias and Byron G. Massialas were among others who mentioned Arnold's role as a comparative educator.[10] Perhaps the best recognition of Arnold's stature as a comparative educator has been provided by Paul Nash's 1966 study Culture and the State: Matthew Arnold and Continental Education which was primarily a volume of extracts from Arnold's writings having foreign education as their principal subject matter, together with an introduction on "Matthew Arnold as Comparative Educator."[11]

Thus, it is manifest that Arnold's endeavours in the area of comparative studies in education have been afforded due acknowledgement but there has been little accomplished beyond this acknowledgement. For, as we shall see more clearly in the review of the literature later on in this chapter, there has been up to now no study of any real substance dealing with Arnold's work in this particular sphere--a strange fact considering the great outpouring over the years in

Arnoldian studies. The chief exception has been Nash's book but even this, leaving aside Arnold's own writings which make up the greatest part of the book, was only thirty-eight pages long. Perhaps this work's main fault consisted in ~~its~~ general failure to provide a satisfactory connection between Arnold's educational views and his wider social and political ones. His domestic and comparative educational writings did not exist in vacuo; they were inseparable from his wider Weltanschauung and some attempt must be made at linkage. Furthermore, Nash was totally inadequate in his treatment of Arnold's theories of how borrowing from Continental practices would help England's educational system--such borrowing being a most important purpose of comparative education according to Arnold. While these limitations are perhaps understandable due to the brevity of Nash's treatment, nevertheless it must be stated that though he was quite correct to write in a 1964 book review that there was "a need for a focused examination of Arnold's specific contributions to the study of comparative education" the introduction to his 1966 volume most assuredly did not satisfy the need.[12] Nor indeed has the requisite volume yet appeared. This is the precise justification for this present study which is intended to be a focused examination of important aspects of Arnold's comparative educational work.

C) Limitations of the Study

Though Arnold's official duties during his thirty-five year period as a H.M.I. were completely concerned with elementary education, the State having no right of inspecting secondary schools, it is his views on secondary and, to a lesser extent, higher education on which focus is placed almost exclusively in this work. For it was the inadequacy of the post-elementary institutions which, Arnold was convinced, was one of the great problems in English society and which was chiefly responsible for his country's lagging behind some of her Continental neighbours in certain respects. Despite the very many problems which persisted in elementary education throughout his life he acknowledged that its future was secured, especially as the involvement of the State at this level was increasing yearly. However, he was never sanguine about England's post-elementary institutions, and particularly those at the secondary level. It should also be pointed out that whenever reference is made to middle class education and popular education, post-elementary and elementary education are meant respectively.

The details which Arnold provided of the actual educational systems and practices of France, Germany, Holland, Switzerland, and Italy, the countries which he covered in his writings on foreign education have been accepted as being in the main true. The intention in this work is not to research the history of the educational provisions of these countries in the nineteenth century. Of greater concern are the lessons which Arnold drew from his comparing and contrasting the various details of his conception of these provisions with those in England. Similarly, no objective history or analysis of English post-elementary education of the period under discussion is provided in this work. Though most commentators would acknowledge that Arnold's criticisms of such education were at times too one-sided, especially with respect to his frequently vitriolic attacks on his nation's secondary schools, the main concern in this thesis is with HIS opinions on the state of post-elementary education, whether or not total trust is to be placed in his judgements. In like manner, there is no discussion of the validity of Arnold's portrayal of the English middle classes, though it is clearly less than totally objective; again, it is his views which constitute this work's chief province.

Though Arnold's opinions on the necessity of increased State-involvement in society are frequently mentioned, another limitation of the thesis is that focus is placed almost entirely on his view of the role of the State with respect to education. He certainly wanted State-intervention in other spheres but a treatment of this would be outside the scope of my study.

D) Original Sources Consulted

Early in the research it was realised that any useful study of Arnold the comparative educator must rest on a thorough examination of all his writings, not a mere selection of them. Consequently, all of his works--poetry, religious, literary, social and political criticism as well as the more narrowly focused educational writings--were studied. This was the only way to obtain an overall grasp of his educational views and to understand how they were thoroughly blended with his wider world picture. Fortunately, apart from his very numerous letters, his work is easily accessible in good editions. R. H. Super's great eleven volume edition of the prose works [13] was completed in 1977, a collection of all the English prose writings "that Arnold published or prepared for publication, whether in books or periodicals."[14] Super included the books on education published by Arnold himself, though he excluded the official reports for the Education Office. Accordingly, use was made of the two editions of the Annual Reports: Reports on Elementary Schools, 1852-1882 edited by Sir Francis Sandford (1889) and Reports on Elementary Schools,1852-1882 edited with introduction by F. S. Marvin (1908).[15] Though Super included the editions published by Arnold himself of his foreign reports for the Newcastle and Taunton Commissions and his report on aspects of Continental education for the Education Department in 1886 attention was also paid to the original reports contained in the Parliamentary Papers and which differ in certain respects from the later versions.[16] In addition, reference was made to Arnold's evidence on April 6 and 7, 1886 before the Cross Commission which Super did not publish.[17]

Of particular significance for any serious study of Arnold are his letters which very often contain important insights and observations--they "constitute an invaluable record of the many-sided activities of the man Arnold and touch upon many aspects of nineteenth-century civilization and culture."[18] However, the definitive edition of the letters has not yet been published. The standard edition is still G. W. E. Russell's two-volume Letters of Matthew Arnold 1848-1888 (1895) but this contains only 533 letters, mainly to members of his family. Moreover, its value is limited due to censorship by the Arnold family, omissions by Russell, lack of an index, and poor annotation.[19] Other collections are the short Unpublished Letters of Matthew Arnold, edited by Arnold Whitridge (1923) [20] and H. F. Lowry's excellent edition of The Letters of

Matthew Arnold to Arthur Hugh Clough (1932).[21] Mention should also be made of William E. Buckler's Matthew Arnold's Books: Toward a Publishing Diary (1956) which is a collection of passages from Arnold's correspondence with his various publishers and which is particularly useful, as the editor remarks, in following "the evolution of Arnold's major works during the last twenty-five years of his life."[22] In addition to these editions reference has also been made to the relatively small number of other letters published here and there over the years in journals and periodicals. A great aid in locating these letters has been A.K. Davis' Matthew Arnold's Letters: A Descriptive Checklist published in 1968 and which listed a total of 2658 letters and their location where known. The Manuscript Division of the Alderman Library of the University of Virginia was also visited. Here the definitive edition of all of Arnold's letters is now nearing completion under the editorship of Professor Cyril Y. Lang, and kind permission was granted to read the as yet unpublished letters either in typescript or in xeroxed copy of the original.

Most useful in the research of this thesis has been The Note-Books of Matthew Arnold (1952) in which Howard Foster Lowry, Karl Young, and Waldo Hilary Dunn have collected together and, for the most part, have identified the thousands of items which Arnold placed in his note-books from 1852 to the year of his death, 1888.[23] Consultation has also been made of the four volume 1959 University of Virginia dissertation by William Bell Guthrie, "Matthew Arnold's Diaries: The Unpublished Items," which provided a good deal of useful material not found in the Note-Books.[24] The two editions of Arnold's poems utilised were C. B.

Tinker and H. F. Lowry (editors), The Poetical Works of Matthew Arnold (1950), and Kenneth Allott (editor), The Poems of Matthew Arnold (1965).[25]

E) Critical Review of the Literature on Arnold

Though there is still a manifest need for a full-length work on Arnold's comparative educational endeavours this, of course, by no means signifies that up to this little of worth has been published which has relevance to this important topic. Indeed, now ninety-nine years after his death there is a very great abundance of books and articles on numerous aspects of Arnold's *oeuvre* and generally the critical literature has been of great use in helping the reader arrive at a surer understanding of Arnold the man and of his work. Nor is there any sign that in the near future there will be any decrease in the outpouring of Arnoldian studies, especially as the centenary of his death will occur in April 1988. Indeed, with the interest in Arnold continuing unabated it is now doubtful whether any other Victorian literary figure has been the subject of so much commentary and critical study over the past hundred years or so. At any rate, before commencing the discussion of aspects of Arnold's comparative educational work, it is intended in the following section to make a brief critical review of a limited number of what are perhaps the most significant studies of this prolific secondary literature, together with an account of some of the main scholarly assessments of Arnold's social, political, cultural, and educational theories. Special attention will be paid to literature more particularly concerned with his views on education, though it must be acknowledged that there is necessarily a great overlap between these and his wider views. In fact, the former are inextricably intertwined with the latter and, consequently, any attempt to provide a review of the literature on Arnold and education must acknowledge the interdependence of his thought and also consider works on Arnold the social, political, and cultural theorist. With a couple of exceptions concentration is on twentieth century studies of Arnold and consequently the critical attitudes of his own nineteenth century contemporaries and near-contemporaries have been ignored. However, an excellent selection from the voluminous nineteenth century writings about his prose works has been compiled by Carl Dawson and John Pfordresher in their Matthew Arnold, Prose Writings: The Critical Heritage (1979), a volume of great help in understanding the reception afforded Arnold in his own day.[26]

i) Works up to 1950

The earliest attempt to provide a full-length account of Arnold the educationist was contained in the second half of Thomas and Matthew Arnold and Their Influence on English Education (1897) by Joshua Fitch, a younger colleague of Arnold in the Education Department.[27] However, this work was little other than a mere encomiastic survey of the main events of Arnold's career as an educationist with an accompanying rather ineffectual commentary; it was whiggish in its interpretation and few adverse criticisms were proffered. In addition, it was almost completely lacking in rigorous analysis and real scholarship and there was little evidence of a thorough analysis of Arnold's writings. In like manner there was little penetrating or thought-provoking to be found in Herbert Paul's short Matthew Arnold (1902) [28], nor in G.W.E. Russell's adulatory 1904 work of the same name.[29]

Some early commentators questioned the veracity of Arnold's factual reportage. For example, George Saintsbury (1899) asserted that the account of studies in English universities at the end of Schools and Universities on the Continent (1868) was "so inaccurate as to be quite incomprehensible."[30] A quarter century earlier Herbert Spencer in The Study of Sociology (1873) had also criticized Arnold's judgement, condemning him as an anti-patriot, that is one who exaggerated and over-emphasized the faults of England but without balancing the evidence or considering the qualitative value of his statements. For example, Spencer demonstrated that Arnold's plaint regarding the lack of ideas in England was patently absurd.[31]

While Stuart P. Sherman's 1917 study Matthew Arnold: How to Know Him had little of interest to say on Arnold as an educationist it did make the important point that his subject's political and social thought were "indetachably related," declaring that Arnold attempted to act as mediator between the essentially elitist views of Carlyle and the essentially democratic views of Mill.[32] Arnold's task was to utilise the virtues of both men while avoiding their extremes. But his aim, stated Sherman, was Aristotle's golden mean and not mediocrity.[33] Irving Babbitt in his 1917 review of Sherman's study declared, as might be expected, his approval of Arnold's advocacy of "a qualitative and selective democracy," a democracy "in which the failure of anyone to measure up to the high standards should be due to inner, not outer hindrances."[34] A later work Charles H. Harvey's Matthew Arnold: A Critic of the Victorian Period (1931) was important for its emphasis on the point that education for Arnold was a broad-ranging concept and one which was inseparably linked to the culture of the people. Arnold invariably viewed education from a wide perspective and indeed his Report of 1861 could be termed a "political treatise." It contained the germ of his conception of the duties and powers of the State. In this respect, it must be remembered, according to Harvey, that Arnold was writing in the hey-day of laissez-faire, before the birth of the Fabian Society and a decade before 1870, such year being denoted by Dicey as the beginning of State action in England because of the introduction of W.E. Forster's Elementary Education Bill.[35]

Most early critics treated Arnold's work in a discrete and disparate manner. If their study were a full-length book they invariably included a chapter on Arnold's poetry, another on his social ideas, yet another on his religious writings, and one, often sketchy and not well researched, on his educational work and theories. But there was generally little attention paid to the inter-relationships of the different aspects of his work, scant understanding of how his poetry influenced his political and social views, how his political views were connected to his politics, how exactly his educational views fitted in with the whole body of his most diverse work, and so on. Certainly, up to the 1930s Arnold's educational doctrines were considered to be quite secondary to most other aspects of his work and, accordingly, suffered from a relative neglect. As a result, J. Dover Wilson in the "Introduction" to his 1932 edition of Culture and Anarchy was quite innovative when he declared that the centre of all Arnold's work resided in his passion for education. Here also was to be found the root of his poetical and religious writings. However, Wilson recognized that all too often critics neglected the educational work in their concentration on Arnold's more literary writings and consequently served him ill, "for to slight or to misunderstand his educational work is to miss the heart of the man." Wilson was adamant that Arnold was "all of a piece" and that his educational views could only be fully understood by considering them in the context of his whole oeuvre.[36]

Certainly no adequate grasp of Arnold's educational theories is possible without first relating them to his political and social criticism. Many critics have endeavoured to pin on him some kind of political label terming him a democrat, a liberal, a conservative, a reactionary and so on. But during the first half of the twentieth century there was no consensus concerning what label was most appropriate to Arnold's politics. For example, Leonard Woolf in After the Deluge (1931) declared that Arnold, though revealing himself as one who espoused democracy in certain writings, nevertheless generally tended to the democracy "of the authoritarian 'democratic' Great State." He was the opponent of individual liberty who wished to augment the power and authority of the State, with his attitude towards liberty and authority being, in fact, the very opposite of democratic. Furthermore, Woolf accused Arnold of adopting, in common with other advocates of the power of the State, a mystical view of its nature.[37] Earlier, Ernest Barker in his Political Thought in England 1848 to 1914 (1915) had asserted that Arnold's teaching, like that of Carlyle, tended towards authoritarianism, that he sought an authority which of necessity had to be "non-representative," and that "the one logical issue" of his theories, though he would straightaway have rejected this conclusion, lay "in a sort of absolute monarchy."[38] However, J. Dover Wilson in his "Matthew Arnold and the Educationists" (1933) took issue with Barker's and Woolf's castigation of Arnold as an authoritarian and a believer in the absolute State, asserting that both men relied too much on Culture and Anarchy without an adequate analysis of Arnold's many other writings. Certainly Arnold believed in the State but not in the absolute State of Prussia nor in any mystical notion of the concept. What he wanted "was the service State in a democratical society, functioning through a democracy which attracted the best brains and spirits of the country."[39]

Howard Mumford Jones in his "Arnold, Aristocracy, and America" (1944) warned of the need to differentiate between the reactionary political views of Arnold of the 1880s and those more liberal ones of the 1860s, though it was true that even during the earlier period restraint was urged in the face of anarchy arising from the extension of democracy. However, generally Arnold was much more favourable to democracy during the Sixties than fifteen to twenty years later when he published a number of articles criticizing democratic government. In particular, Jones considered that the writings which resulted from his American tour of 1883 reveal "a working interrelation between the Arnoldian doctrine of culture and the Arnoldian belief in racial snobbery and anti-democratic political action."[40] Charles Harvey tended towards Jones' thesis, stating that by 1886 Arnold though nominally a Liberal was in effect completely on the side of the Conservatives and showing a special regard for the Liberal Unionists.[41]

Turning to Benjamin Evans Lippincott's Victorian Critics of Democracy (1938) we find a balanced account of Arnold's social and political views with evidence for Arnold the reactionary as well as Arnold the egalitarian and democrat. He admitted that in places Arnold displayed "some of the brutality of a revolutionary" and that he often associated the lower classes "with brutality and violence." This reaction, according to Lippincott, owed much to Arnold being limited by his own middle class attitudes, which were analogous to the old "Roman view": i.e. the working classes were the populace, brutal and prone to insurrection. Nevertheless, Lippincott considered that Arnold, despite certain authoritarian tendencies towards the lower orders, understood, unlike Carlyle and Ruskin and just as much as Mill, the need for democracy and equality; he realized "that democracy without equality could never mean freedom; Arnold anticipated the Fabians by two decades." Moreover, in order to instigate this egalitarian democracy it was necessary to eliminate the gross inequalities of property. However, democracy for Arnold did not mean that everyone was to be absolutely equal with no distinctions at all of ability or property among persons. Lippincott stated that Arnold's democracy would be analogous to the Athenian society at the time of Pericles though with no slaves. It was to be aristocratic as well as democratic, i.e. "aristocratic in that only a few could hope to pursue it adequately" and "democratic in that all could participate in it to some extent."[42]

A short but perceptive treatment of Arnold the educationist was contained in Alexander Meiklejohn's Education Between Two Worlds (1942) where a limited attempt was made to place Arnold's educational views in the wider context of his general world view. Meiklejohn wrote that it is misleading to call Arnold an educational reformer for he was not interested to any great extent in methods of teaching; rather than concentrating on criticism of what went on in the classrooms he was much more concerned with criticizing the GEIST, to use one of his own words, of the community, the attitudes, standards, habits, and behaviour of the wider society. Still, Meiklejohn considered Arnold the most significant English-speaking proponent of the more traditional education in the period just before the onslaught of pragmatism. However, he held that Arnold's outlook was narrow in certain respects. His notion of "literature," for example, was distinctly limited, to such an extent, indeed, that he himself could, perhaps, be justly called a Philistine by students of economics, politics, history, and natural science. In addition, his view of the State as a cultural force was a rather vague one--he never explained satisfactorily how the government would manage to promulgate the requisite "sweetness and light." With respect to such topics "of basic political theory his mind did little grappling."[43]

If an attempt is made to summarize or provide neat generalizations of the foregoing brief selection of critical views on Arnold it is soon seen that the task is well-nigh impossible. That diverse different opinions should have resulted is perhaps to have been expected especially as the subject was a very wide-ranging and indeed protean thinker like Arnold. However, a perusal of the literature on Arnold the educationist is suggestive in two respects: one, the relative scarcity of such criticism and, two, the lack of depth and scholarship. Certainly, the first half of this century saw a great number of studies on different aspects of Arnold's life and work and though many critics devoted a short chapter to "Education" or provided a few appropriate paragraphs the overall treatment was facile and wanting in real scholarship. Arnold the poet, the literary critic, the social commentator generally received much more fruitful attention than Arnold the educationist. Moreover, as has been mentioned, Arnold's educational views, when in fact considered at all, were generally treated in a vacuum, isolated from the relationships they necessarily bore to the wider body of his broad-ranging work. Scholars, in short, tended to compartmentalize his thought. But in Arnold's case it is often very difficult to distinguish clearly between certain educational writings and those of a social and political nature. Issues in these fields are frequently mingled and sometimes only arbitrary and artificial distinctions may be made. Consequently, it is generally essential to consider Arnold's thought as a whole and to appreciate the interrelationships and the blendings into each other of all parts of his work even though, for ease, we tend to divide them up into narrow categories. Even Lionel Trilling's lengthy and sympathetic Matthew Arnold (1939) [44], which was perhaps the best general study of Arnold appearing during this period, paid scant heed to his educational work and views, with less attention seemingly being shown to the Annual School Reports than to any other of his writings. Of course, with respect to these Reports, even as far back as 1899 George Saintsbury was perceptive enough to realise that it was unlikely that they would ever have many readers, something he lamented since they supplied a side of Arnold's "character nowhere else (except in glimpses) provided by his extant work."[45] In fine, if adjectives are to be attributed to the period's treatment of Arnold the educationist they must include: simplistic, facile, and inadequate. Furthermore, apart from Fitch's very weak 1897 volume no full-length work appeared and the criticism which was in fact published was generally heavily overshadowed by that treating other more popular aspects of Arnold's work. Assuredly, nothing like a definitive study on Arnold the educationist was produced.

ii) Works from 1950 to the Present

1950 saw the publication of W. F. Connell's The Educational Thought and Influence of Matthew Arnold [46], an excellent full-length survey of the development of Arnold the educationist. The delineation of this development was set firmly against the political, social, and educational currents of contemporary England, particularly the conflict of the various opinions on the question of a national system of education. Thus, as well as providing a good exegesis of Arnold's ideas Connell offered suggestive insights into the general history of English nineteenth century education. The book was based on thorough scholarship and, accordingly, marked a watershed in the history of criticism on Arnold and education--it is still, even today, the best overall examination of the subject. However, as might be expected, it did not deal in detail with all pertinent areas of Arnold's educational work. For example, while Connell admittedly discussed his role as a comparative educator he did so in only a page.[47]

G. H. Bantock is another scholar who over a thirty year period has written intelligently on Arnold and education. In his 1952 article "Matthew Arnold, H. M. I." he expressed his admiration for Arnold's educational philosophy and stress on proper ends and standards and contrasted him favourably with a "comparatively superficial" thinker like John Dewey whom he felt has had a deleterious effect on English education.[48] In a slighter article of a few years later, "Matthew Arnold and Education" (1955), Bantock offered the good advice that if one is to gain a true understanding of "culture" and to overcome the vagueness and abstractness to which this notion is sometimes heir in Culture and Anarchy then one should read Arnold's work as a whole; and, in fact, this was mandatory "for the implications of a concept such as 'culture' cannot expect to take on definition and individuality except as the outcome of prolonged and particularized judgements."[49] Bantock returned to Arnold almost thirty years later in "The Best Self: Matthew Arnold" (1984) where he identified a number of problems and inconsistencies in Arnold's thought. He suggested that there might be some tension between Arnold's disavowal of systems and his belief in the institution of the State. Likewise, he found it very hard to reconcile Arnold's desire for equality and his notion of a clerisy, the "remnant" or the "aliens." Again, while Arnold left cultural authority and the maintenance of standards to a select group of "aliens" he considered that the men of culture should not have political power. But, as Bantock asked, who exactly were the men to undertake the actual running of the State?[50]

Raymond Williams in his Culture and Society 1780-1950 (1958) though quite critical of many of Arnold's views, also displayed a certain sympathy for his "best spirit," holding that we should continue to heed this "great and important figure in nineteenth-century thought" and when we answer him "we can hardly speak better than in his own best spirit."[51] Nevertheless, Williams considered that Arnold was unfair to England's Philistines, accusing him of exaggerating the stock notion of their priggishness and spiritual pride. His attitude towards a vulgar class was itself essentially vulgar, the tone possessing "a kind of witty and malicious observation better suited to minor fiction."[52] He held that Arnold misunderstood the lower classes also, rejecting as unfair his view of the working class movement leading the country to the brink of anarchy. On the contrary, he declared, the working classes have traditionally abstained from violent tactics and have generally adopted peaceful methods to further their advance. In short, Arnold gave a biased and fundamentally unjust picture of this order which, according to Williams, "had more to offer to the 'pursuit of perfection' than Matthew Arnold, seeing only his magnified image of the Rough, was able to realize."[53] Arnold's lack of understanding of the working classes was also considered in The Rise and Fall of the Man of Letters (1969) [54] where John Gross was at pains to point out that Arnold often did not bother to distinguish between different elements of these classes; he tarred all with the same brush. Nevertheless, Gross was also concerned to stress that Arnold was genuinely anxious for the betterment of the working classes, and particularly their children.

John Gribble in the introduction to his 1967 selection of extracts from Arnold's educational writings [55] discussed Arnold as a philosopher of education. His logical skills were criticized severely, and he was accused of vagueness, inconsistency, inexpertness in reasoning, and ambivalence--in this last matter Gribble was echoing the main thesis of Gaylord C. Le Roy's two studies, "Ambivalence in Matthew Arnold's Prose Criticism" (1952) and Perplexed Prophets: Six Nineteenth-Century British Authors (1952).[56] In the one Arnold existed both a professed egalitarian and a man responsible for "some of the most trenchantly inegalitarian pronouncements ever made."[57] In some writings Arnold appeared to oppose class divisions and to favour more social mobility. Yet, Gribble pointed to clear ambivalence in him also calling for different kinds of education for different classes. He, in effect, found Arnold's views so ambivalent and inconsistent that he warned critics of the dangers of treating him in a precipitous, simplistic manner. Arnold is not easy; he is an extremely complex writer and Gribble's assertion carries some persuasion, namely that Arnold has the ability of being "all things to all men" and that an appropriate motto for his thought would be "attack me if you can find me."[58]

The question of Arnold's political stance, and more particularly, whether he tended towards democracy and egalitarianism or towards reaction and authoritarianism, continued to be the source of much debate after 1950. Kenneth Allott (1955), for example, pointing out that some critics regarded Arnold's view of the State as having dangerous Hegelian connotations asserted, on the contrary, that it was "quite wrong to suppose that Arnold had a sneaking weakness for authoritarianism." Rather, his view of the State was very similar to that held by his father and both of them were very influenced in this respect by Burke.[59] However, Fred G. Walcott (1970) wrote that Arnold was linked temperamentally to a Platonic way of thinking and that consequently there was an inevitable authoritarianism in his thought. But Walcott downplayed this tendency, asserting that generally "the tenor of his life was lofty."[60] Similarly, P.J. Keating in his essay on "Arnold's Social and Political Thought" (1976) admitted that there existed "an undercurrent of authoritarianism" in Arnold's work, a hint that if sufficiently provoked he really would use the Tarpeian Rock for getting rid of the "enemies of reason."[61] Nevertheless, he argued that it was misleading to overstress this undercurrent; while Arnold was certainly imbued with authoritarian tendencies this did not necessarily mean that he was himself an authoritarian--in fact, "the whole intellectual and emotional force of his work directs one to a quite contrary conclusion."[62] In like manner, Patrick Brantlinger in The Spirit of Reform: British Literature and Politics, 1832-1867 (1977) offered the opinion that Arnold was essentially liberal, "at least in the Trollopean sense of 'advanced conservative liberalism.'"[63]

In a stimulating paper of 1971 R. Sheppard compared and contrasted the liberalism of Matthew Arnold and Wilhelm Von Humboldt pinpointing the weaknesses of each.[64] Arnold's liberalism was criticized as being idealistic, anachronistic, and perhaps naive. He had an over-confident faith in social progress. It was simplistic to hold that a happy future for society would be nigh if all men of good will strove for egalitarian and humanitarian changes. He had little conception, according to Sheppard, of the power of economic forces to undermine and debase the noblest goals of a liberal education. Nor did he understand "the ability of capitalism to absorb even the best of piecemeal reforms and pervert them to its own inhuman ends while allowing their practitioners to remain under the illusion that a process of human betterment is taking place."[65] While it might be felt by some that Sheppard placed too much stress on the destructive powers of capitalism and underestimated the ability of social and educational reforms and progress to occur under such a system, still he was quite correct in stating that Arnold paid too little attention to the economic forces in society. Indeed, it is time for more study of Arnold's economic views, their relation to his wider social and political beliefs and more particularly to his opinions on education. Much attention has been focused on what role "culture" was to play in effecting social progress. But what connection would economic forces have in such progress?

One of the best analyses of Arnold's social and political thought is contained in Patrick J. McCarthy's Matthew Arnold and the Three Classes (1964). McCarthy argued that though the aristocracy, the "Barbarians," were indeed a main target for Arnold's disapproval he was still deep-down loath to offend them over much. He mitigated and palliated his charges against them to such an extent "that there is no question which of the three classes Arnold preferred." His predominant feeling towards the "Populace," McCarthy considered, was one of disdain coupled with the fear that they were liable to revolt at any time, though he admitted that "the current of Arnold's feeling for the misery and sufferings of the poor never failed." However, there was no doubt that the middle classes, the "Philistines," bore the brunt of his invective. With the passing of the years, declared McCarthy, his loathing for them grew ever more and he was especially unsympathetic regarding "the narrowness of the Dissenters." The impression was unavoidable "that though he met and observed them, he did not know them and could not love them. He never speaks to them without condescension." In addition, McCarthy demonstrated that in Arnold's later years his politics took "on a reactionary cast;" his call now was "for coercion, censorship of the press, and Conservative rule."[66]

Much of the literature has considered the reliability of Arnold's social criticism and he has been subject to sharp attacks. For example, Geoffrey Carnall (1958) in dismissing his critical efforts went so far as to categorize him as having been "extremely unscrupulous in controversy," "nimble," and as one who engaged in "sharp practice."[67] In like manner, George Watson (1967) attacked Arnold's credibility and integrity considering that his arguments seemed "remote from any concern with accuracy or fair-mindedness. The love of truth was something he appears simply to have outlived."[68] However, Carnall's and Watson's censures would perhaps have carried more weight if they had been accompanied by more extensive supporting evidence. That provided was too flimsy. Gross (1969), Keating (1976), and Michael Thorpe (1969) also had sharp words to offer on Arnold's judgements and all three accused him of succumbing to partiality and prejudice.[69]

Yet J.D. Jump in his Matthew Arnold (1955) suggested that the dominant impression one obtained from the various prose writings was that of sanity besides which Carlyle appeared "grotesquely prejudiced," Ruskin "febrile and unbalanced," Morris "irresponsibly escapist," with even Mill "like the victim of a system."[70] In a later essay, "Matthew Arnold" (1982), Jump, while admitting that Arnold was not always completely exempt from bias, claimed that he was "remarkably fair-minded" and particularly so for not being subject "to any tyrannical system or orthodoxy."[71] At any rate, there is no doubt that if an adequate assessment is to be made of Arnold's judgement, objectivity, and fair-mindedness it is manifest that he must be studied in the wider context of the prevailing social and political climate. This will also help in preventing his views being regarded as academic utterances divorced from any practical considerations of everyday life. With respect to this latter point it must be remembered that Arnold played a leading role in contemporary social and political debate.[72] As a number of critics have stressed, notably Williams (1958), Bush (1971), and Thorpe (1969), Arnold was by no means the stereotypical philosopher figure, a recluse from the prevailing currents of the day.[73]

Opinions have varied regarding just how important were the educational work and writings in the forming of this multifaceted man. Fred G. Walcott (1970) sought to show that Arnold's day-to-day inspectorial work had a very strong influence on his social and political thought. Although his interest in literary matters persisted all his life his purely educational work came to overshadow it and eventually absorbed it--"In the worker and the teacher, the soul of Arnold is to be surprised." Consequently, Walcott stressed the necessity of focusing on Arnold's official work.[74] However, Gillian Sutherland in her Matthew Arnold on Education (1973) disagreed with those critics who maintain that Arnold's inspectorial duties gave special weight to his social and educational views. For she considered that his poetry, the influence of his father, and his interest in middle-class education were just as significant as his work as an HMI in the moulding of his educational opinions.[75] But Peter Smith and Geoffrey Summerfield in their Matthew Arnold and the Education of the New Order (1969) maintained that the relative neglect by students of Arnold's educational experience and writings was unfortunate especially as "this work is central to the thought and ambitions of this educator, and is of a piece with much of his other writings." In particular, they emphasized the importance of Arnold's Annual Reports representing, as they do, "the first expression of a supremely civilized mind's response to first-hand observation of democratic education in practice."[76]

With respect to the important Arnoldian notion of "culture" the majority of critics have paid little attention to its relationship with the school curriculum but have tended to treat it in a wider sociological and more indefinite sense. Patrick Brantlinger maintained that Arnold considered everything except "culture" to be connected to class and party but that he neglected to explain how it remains isolated--a notion which was "very much a product of wishful thinking." He also stressed that Arnold's "culture" was essentially elitist and that though he worked hard to make some measure of it available to those working class children whom he met in his capacity as an HMI he greatly underestimated the difficulty of attaining it. In addition, Brantlinger believed that this "culture" had little to do with political and social reform, for Arnold wanted ideas to be reformed before the change of institutions. He sought to substitute "criticisms of modes of thought for criticisms of social structures." In short, he considered that "culture" for Arnold "is of some other time and place, an educator's utopia."[77] Indeed, T.M. Bamford stated that if we are to accept Arnold's definition of "culture," then "we are back to Athens."[78] Roy Fuller, a successor as Professor of Poetry at Oxford, agreed that Arnold's "culture" was inadequate for effecting all that he expected it to, "for surely history proves that the horse of social change must be put before the cart of cultural enlightenment."[79] Basil Willey also tended to agree that Arnold's notion of "culture" was elitist and had little to do with the harsh realities of working class education. For it came to signify all that he held most dearly: religion, good learning, criticism, and poetry together with "the ideas of the State, the National Establishment and the University, the latter symbolized for him, of course, by Oxford."[80] John Gross declared that there were intangible as well as tangible aspects in Arnold's notion of "culture" with the former being somehow a sort of state of mind or literary ideal drawing on "many elements from Homer to Wordsworth" and the latter owing much to the way of life which he himself led and which could be summed up by the word "Oxford."[81] Similarly, Imelda Palmer in her Matthew Arnold: Culture, Society and Education (1979) made it clear that "culture" signified literary culture, especially that of Greek and Latin, and one which in any real practical sense could not be suited to the elementary school. This was just one of "the extraordinary number of contradictions in Arnold's attitude to elementary education."[82] Curtis and Boultwood (1977) also considered that Arnold's particular type of "culture" was defective in that there was a distinct tendency for it to be too academic. Nevertheless, while agreeing with Frederic Harrison that Arnold neglected to supply the relevant details of the "machinery" for the attainment of "culture" they stated that this is only true vis-à-vis Culture and Anarchy. The various domestic and foreign reports furnish a quantity of details.[83] They thus agreed with Connell who wrote that "The practical educational implications of his doctrine [i.e. of culture] were to be found, not in Culture and Anarchy, but scattered mainly throughout his General Reports and Special Reports."[84]

The most recent book on Arnold the educationist was that of Imelda Palmer (1979) mentioned above, the main concern of which was how Arnold perceived culture and society and how these perceptions influenced his educational writings. It was a short work, covering only 95 pages of text, and the analysis provided was often far from penetrating. However, it did have the merit of focusing on certain contradictions, anomalies, and inconsistencies in Arnold's work, thereby providing food for thought to those who jump very quickly to conclusions regarding Arnold's views. For example, Arnold professed himself to be a staunch advocate of social equality, especially as set out in his lecture "Equality" before the Royal Institution in 1878, while at the same time he argued for "the men of culture" or the "aliens." However, Palmer argued that social equality and "aliens" are mutually contradictory;

for what is the meaning of advocating the abolition of social classes while also desiring the creation of an elite which controls political power? In fact, she considered the "aliens" to be similar to Plato's "philosopher kings." She concluded, consequently, that "What Arnold is really arguing for here is not equality, but rule by merit."[85] Later on she asserted that Arnold's idea of how classes are characterized was "simplistic" and that he saw a strong correlation between an individual's class origin and his "destination." Generally, she held that Arnold's view of education "would re-inforce class and help perpetuate a stratified society"; what, in fact, his theories really signified was not social equality but "social harmony."[86]

This outline survey of the literature on Arnold the educationist, as well as on some of his social and political views, could go on and on; the general bibliography on Arnold is vast. Though a multitude of other significant books and articles could have been selected for mention the works actually discussed are, it is considered, representative of the main research interests on Arnold's broad educational views. As pointed out earlier, many studies which are more directly concerned with Arnold's social, political, and cultural criticism, most of which broaden in some way our understanding of Arnold the educationist, have been avoided in this review. But it is worthwhile reiterating that his educational views did not exist in isolation and that very often only artificial distinctions can be made between different categories of criticism, for example educational and social thought; Arnold's writings on, respectively, education, society, politics are frequently dealing with very similar matters.

iii) Works on Arnold the Comparative Critic

It is important, also, to reiterate that one aspect of Arnold's career which the literature has not treated adequately is his work as a comparative educator. Of course, his writings on foreign education have often received a mention in the literature but they have seldom been discussed in any real depth. Paul Nash's less than satisfactory study has been referred to earlier. Mention should, in passing, also be made of P.H. Butterfield's 1967 article "Aspects of the Work of Matthew Arnold for Royal Commissions."[87] But as this was only eight pages in length, being mainly descriptive and lacking in any worthwhile analysis, it may be dismissed as being of little real consequence. McCarthy (1964) also touched on Arnold's work abroad but there was nothing very important in his treatment. However, he did emphasize the significance of Arnold's experiences on the Continent for the development of his educational thought and he stated that his six month sojourn in France in 1859 working for the Newcastle Commission was "one of the great illuminating periods of his life." It was here that he learned "that an agency to train and organize, control and civilize the newly emergent forces did exist--the modern state," and in the Report for the Commission that he "extolled the virtues of collective action to a nation that had made Smiles's Self-Help a best-seller."[88] Walcott also discussed Arnold's various writings on foreign education placing them in the context of the development of his wider educational views; he particularly stressed the influence of Arnold's trip abroad for the Newcastle Commission on the formation of these views. However, Walcott had little to say on middle class education, and understandably so, as his primary theme was Arnold and popular education in England.[89]

Two general works which had some indirect bearing on Arnold's comparative educational work were Alexander P. Kelso's Matthew Arnold and Continental Life and Literature (1914) and Frederic E. Faverty's Matthew Arnold the Ethnologist (1951).[90] The former was a very slight work offering few insights though it did provide brief accounts of Arnold's views of various aspects of French, German, and Italian life including the educational systems of these countries. Kelso also attempted to show how Arnold was himself affected by his Continental experiences. He saw two main results of Arnold's work in Europe. First, his criticism helped to inculcate a more objective attitude towards the Continent in its over-sympathetic admirers and, secondly, he helped to eradicate the insularity prevalent among many English. Faverty's work was a scholarly and entertaining study of "some of the maddest of theories and one of the sanest of men," i.e. last century's racial theories and Matthew Arnold.[91] Though Faverty was generally sympathetic to Arnold's motives in dealing with racial and national characteristics he revealed that his subject fell into many errors in this field. In like manner, Heinrich Straumann in his 1964 article analysing Schools and Universities on the Continent found evidence of generalization belonging "to that category of national or ethnological images which are closer to myths than to verifiable abstractions. In Arnold's chain of ideas they probably represent the weakest links. Celtic melancholy, German steadiness, English energy and lack of intelligence, Jewish morality, to mention only a few--they all sound a little preposterous nowadays." However, Straumann also praised Schools and Universities on the Continent for revealing "Arnold as a remarkably precise observer and careful interpreter of extremely complex material--qualities by no means generally assumed in his case."[92]

Many other studies have dealt with different aspects of Arnold's relations with European countries but the vast majority of these have been concerned with the influence exerted by certain Continental authors on the development of Arnold the littérateur and with his critical essays on foreign writers rather than with his social and educational criticism of these countries. Brief mention may be made of F. J. W. Harding's Matthew Arnold: The Critic and France (1964) which, to date, has been the best all-round survey of Arnold's views on French subjects. However, the most satisfactory aspect of the book is Harding's examination of Arnold's criticism of French literature and French society, with, however, the part of a chapter devoted to Arnold on the education of that country, though admittedly containing a few useful insights, being little more than a précis or summary of the appropriate educational writings and Reports rather than a worthwhile analysis. Nevertheless, Harding thought highly enough of Arnold's endeavours in the comparative educational field for him to write that "he may now be regarded as a true pioneer in the field of comparative education, and a leading authority on French education in the nineteenth century."[93] Of only minor interest is the chapter on Arnold in Christophe Campos' The View of France: From Arnold to Bloomsbury (1965), for though the author devoted a few pages to

Arnold's writings on French education the treatment was scrappy and perfunctory.[94] Arnold's dealings with Germany have received little enough attention from scholars though there have been some interesting studies on Arnold and certain literary figures such as Heine and Goethe. Certainly, hardly anything has been written on his views concerning German education. At any rate, it seems clear that while the overall criticism on Arnold is enormous with very many aspects of his career and writings receiving scholarly treatment there still remains one important area for which there is a pressing need for a full-length study, namely Arnold the comparative educational critic. It is hoped that this present work will help fill this lacuna in Arnoldian studies.

F) Outline of the Subsequent Chapters

The following is a very brief outline of the essential contents of the subsequent six chapters. Chapter Two, "Matthew Arnold, Comparative Educator," after an introduction illustrating Arnold's great liking for and interest in many features, educational and otherwise, of Continental Europe, considers his views on the nature and purpose of comparative education and of comparative studies in general. It is argued that though he clearly desired to introduce into England some aspects of Continental education, and that in this regard he was at one with respect to the general ameliorative purpose of comparative education held by his contemporaries, his motives as a comparativist had a much wider basis than the mere improvement of England's educational provision. For his studies of foreign societies had inculcated deep within him the desire to change thoroughly the whole intellectual and cultural tone of his compatriots, especially that of the middle class, a transformation which admittedly was to be brought about by adapting in England's educational structure certain Continental features. Though he wrote very little on the topic some account is then provided of Arnold's views on the appropriate methodology to be employed in undertaking comparative educational work. The second half of the chapter is concerned with sketching some of the more important details and conclusions contained in the major reports and publications stemming from Arnold's official tours abroad.

Chapter Three, "Arnold and the Role of the State in Modern Society," examines a most significant lesson resulting from all the various foreign influences on Arnold, namely his understanding of the part to be played by the State in helping to bring about a modern society. An analysis is made of what exactly Arnold meant by the State, what precise role he intended that the "aliens" or saving "remnant" should play in it, and whether he should be termed a totalitarian or democrat. It is argued also that it was his practical experiences on the Continent more than all other influences which caused him to be imbued with the fervent conviction that changes in society now necessitated the introduction of increased State involvement, particularly in the educational sphere, into England. For it is contended that Arnold was very favourably impressed with the role of the State and its resultant civil organisation as an agency for effecting true modernity and its concomitant "intellectual deliverance" in certain Continental countries, that he believed that it was the State-controlled educational system in these countries which was particularly responsible for such modernity, and that he became convinced that it was such a State wherein lay the antidote to England's ills. However, it is pointed out that while Arnold himself was staunch in these beliefs he was well aware of the great antagonism of many of his compatriots to any increase in the power of the State and State-action and particularly so in the sphere of education.

It is often observed that Arnold, primarily because his work as a School Inspector caused him to travel throughout England and to come into contact with all classes of society, was far from being a mere armchair critic but, on the contrary, was a social commentator who knew his country better than most. At any rate, for much of his life he was deeply disturbed by the whole structure of English society, a moribund society which he felt was disintegrating about him and was at times teetering on the verge of anarchy. Though he found fault with all social classes in England there was one which especially bore the brunt of his invective for failing to withstand and correct the pressing problems confronting society; indeed, he considered that its members were particularly responsible for creating many of these problems. This was England's middle class. Chapter Four, "Arnold on the Inferior Civilisation of the English Middle Class," examines his views on these "Philistines" and discusses his sweeping and oft-repeated criticisms of their nature and society which he felt were grossly inadequate to meet the needs of a modern age. Special attention is given to his strictures respecting their Philistinism, their Hebraism, their Dissent, their participation in the "religion of inequality," and their close association with the Liberal Party.

Of course, while Arnold realized that many diverse factors accounted for the French and German middle classes being imbued with that lucidity and understanding which made them receptive to the modern age, his extensive experiences of educational institutions both at home and on the Continent nurtured the belief that it was their State-controlled educational systems which went a long way towards developing their superiority to the corresponding English class in this regard. For, as we have seen, he was adamant that his country's middle class education, especially at the secondary level, was appalling; indeed, he argued that their secondary schools were among the worst in the civilized world. Moreover, he was assured that England's post-elementary education was quite clearly very inferior to that of the Germans and French. Chapter Five, "'Our Middle Classes are Nearly the Worst Educated in the World,'" analyses just why Arnold found English middle class education to be so deficient, especially when contrasted with that on the Continent, his main recurring criticism being the lack of State control. With respect to secondary schools an examination is made of such objections as the lack of suitable institutions, the absence of adequate control and securities, the generally poor quality of teachers, the weakness and absence of standardization of curriculum and texts, the separation of classes being fostered and perpetuated by the existing system. Also discussed, though Arnold wrote comparatively little on this educational level, are the defects which he identified in England's higher education. The chapter concludes with a discussion of his conviction that there was an urgent necessity for England's post-elementary education to be improved, a procedure which would be the greatest agency for transforming the middle classes.

Chapter Six, "Arnold's Prescriptions for Improving Secondary and Higher Education in England," analyses the various recommendations scattered through his writings for improving England's middle class education and thereby for transforming Philistine society. As he himself did not write a detailed account, being little interested as he asserted on many occasions in the "machinery" or the minutiae of plans, it is naturally impossible for me to provide a clear blue-print of his proposals for secondary and higher education. Nevertheless, he did offer numerous pointers throughout his works which enable me to draw up the broad outlines of a plan describing how he would have liked his new post-elementary system to appear. Very evident in my account will be the very great influence exerted upon him by Continental educational systems and above all by their close association with the State. Then the final chapter, Chapter Seven, provides a brief summary of the thesis's arguments as well as a few further thoughts in conclusion. In particular, consideration is given to Arnold's significance as a prophet in the sphere of English post-elementary education.

REFERENCES

1. Though Arnold held this view throughout his life he was particularly vocal in expressing it during the mid-1860s. For example, mention may be made of two letters, one written during his work abroad for the Taunton Commission, the other just after he had returned from the Continent. Writing to his mother from Zurich on October 24, 1865, and concerned at the eulogistic treatment meted out by the English papers to Lord Palmerston who had died a week earlier, he took occasion to censure the three English classes as well as to argue that England has now slipped to at least third power on the world's stage. Palmerston, he wrote: "found his country the first power in the world's estimation and he leaves it the third; of this no person with eyes to see and ears to hear, and opportunities for using them, can doubt; it may even be doubted, whether, thanks to Bismarck's audacity, resolution, and success, Prussia, too, as well as France and the United States, does not come before England at present in general respect. The mass of the English public, too, with the want of ideas of its aristocratic class, the provincial narrowness and vulgarity of its middle class, and the nonage of its lower, is exactly at Lord Palmerston's level and not a bit beyond it." [Letter to his mother, October 24, 1865, Letters of Matthew Arnold, 1848-1888, ed. George W.E. Russell, 2 vols. (London: Macmillan, 1895), 1:306] The following month, back in London, Arnold wrote in a similar vein to his sister Fan concerning England's decline: "Whatever Mary may say, or the English may think, I have a conviction that there is a real, an almost imminent danger of England losing immeasurably in all ways, declining into a sort of greater Holland, for want of what I call ideas, for want of perceiving how the world is going and must go, and preparing herself accordingly. This conviction haunts me, and at times even overwhelms me with depression; I would rather not live to see the change come to pass, for we shall all deteriorate under it. While there is time I will do all I can, and in every way, to prevent its coming to pass. Sometimes, no doubt, turning oneself one way after another, one must make unsuccessful and unwise hits, and one may fail after all; but try I must, and I know that it is only by facing in every direction that one can win the day." (Letter to his sister Fan, November 1865, Ibid., pp. 309-310).

2. Jerold J. Savory, review of Park Honan, Matthew Arnold: A Life (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1981), Victorian Poetry 20, No. 2 (Summer 1982):197. Rose Bachem called Arnold "a real champion of comparative studies in his time." [Rose Bachem, "Pioneers of Comparative Literature in the 19th Century," Revue de Littérature Comparée 42, No. 4 (Oct/Dec. 1968):598-599].

3. In his essay "Eugénie de Guérin", referring to a writer in the National Review who had come across de Guérin's journal, parts of which had been printed for private circulation, Arnold wrote: "The bees of our English criticism do not often roam so far

afield for their honey, and this critic deserves thanks for having flitted in his quest of blossom to foreign parts, and for having settled upon a beautiful flower found there." ["Eugénie de Guérin," *The Complete Prose Works of Matthew Arnold*, ed. R.H. Super, 11 vols. (Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 1960-1977), 3:84. (Super's text will hereinafter be referred to as *Prose Works* with the appropriate volume number)].

4. Nicholas Hans, "English Pioneers of Comparative Education," *British Journal of Educational Studies* 1, No. 1, (Nov. 1952):57. See also N. Hans, *Comparative Education: A Study of Educational Factors and Traditions* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1980, 1st ed. 1949), p. 2.

5. G.H. Bantock, "Matthew Arnold, H.M.I.," *Freedom and Authority in Education* (London: Faber and Faber, 1970, 1st ed. 1952), p. 86. See also V. Mallinson, *An Introduction to the Study of Comparative Education*, 4th ed. (London: Heinemann, 1975) p. 1.

6. W.F. Connell, *The Educational Thought and Influence of Matthew Arnold*, (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1950), p. 229. Also H.C. Barnard, *A History of English Education From 1760* (London: University of London Press, 1961), p. 146. David Hopkinson, "The Arnolds and Elementary Education," *The Arnoldian* 9, No. 2 (Spring 1982):25.

7. S.J. Curtis and M.E.A. Boultwood, *A Short History of Educational Ideas*, 5th ed. (London: University Tutorial Press, 1977), p. 452.

8. G.Z.F. Bereday, *Comparative Method in Education* (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1964), p. 7.

9. H.J. Noah and M.A. Eckstein, *Toward a Science of Comparative Education* (New York: Macmillan, 1969), p. 18. See also E.J. King, *Comparative Studies in Educational Decision* (London: Methuen, 1968), p. 85. Also W.V. Brewer, *Victor Cousin as a Comparative Educator* (New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1971), p. 137.

10. S. Fraser, *Jullien's Plan for Comparative Education 1816-1817* (New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1964), p. 114. A.M. Kazamias and B.G. Massialas, *Tradition and Change in Education* (New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1965), p.2.

11. P. Nash, *Culture and the State: Matthew Arnold and Continental Education* (New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1966).

12. Paul Nash, *Comparative Education Review* 8, No. 2 (October 1964):243.

13. R.H. Super, *Prose Works*, 11 vols.

14. Ibid., 1:v.

15. Matthew Arnold, *Reports on Elementary Schools, 1852-1882*, ed. Sir Francis Sandford (London and New York: Macmillan, 1889); *Reports on Elementary Schools, 1852-1882*, ed. F.S. Marvin (London: Wyman, 1908).

16. Arnold's report for the Newcastle Commission, "Report on the Systems of Popular Education in Use in France, Holland, and the French Cantons of Switzerland" (1861), is contained in *British Parliamentary Papers, Education General*, Vol. 6, pp. 13-160 (Shannon, Ireland: Irish University Press, 1969); his report for the Taunton Commission, "Report on the System of Education for the Middle and Upper Classes in France, Italy, Germany, and Switzerland" (1868), is contained in *British Parliamentary Papers, Education General*, Vol. 21, pp. 449-712 (Shannon, Ireland: Irish University Press, 1970); his report for the Education Department, "Special Report on Certain Points Connected with Elementary Education in Germany, Switzerland, and France" (1886) is contained in *British Sessional Papers*, House of Commons, Vol. LI, pp. 245-272.

17. Arnold's evidence before the Cross Commission is contained in *British Parliamentary Papers, Education General*, Vol. 34, pp. 184-225 (Shannon, Ireland: Irish University Press, 1970).

18. Arthur Kyle Davis, Jr., *Matthew Arnold's Letters: A Descriptive Checklist* (Charlottesville, Virginia: The University Press of Virginia, 1968), p. xii.

19. G.W.E. Russell, *Letters*, 2 Vols.

20. Arnold Whitridge, ed., *Unpublished Letters of Matthew Arnold* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1923).

21. H.F. Lowry, ed., *The Letters of Matthew Arnold to Arthur Hugh Clough* (London: Oxford University Press, 1932).

22. William E. Buckler, ed., *Matthew Arnold's Books: Toward a Publishing Diary* (Geneva: Libraire E. Droz, 1958).

23. H.F. Lowry, Karl Young, and W.H. Dunn, eds., *The Note-Books of Matthew Arnold* (London: Oxford University Press, 1952).

24. William Bell Guthrie, "Matthew Arnold's Diaries: The Unpublished Items," Ph.D. thesis, University of Virginia, 1959 (Ann Arbor, Mich.: University Microfilms).

25. C.B. Tinker and H.F. Lowry, eds., *The Poetical Works of Matthew Arnold* (London: Oxford University Press, 1950); Kenneth Allott, ed., *The Poems of Matthew Arnold* (New York: Barnes and Noble, 1965).

26. Carl Dawson and John Pfordresher, eds., Matthew Arnold, Prose Writings: The Critical Heritage (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1979).

27. Sir Joshua Fitch, Thomas and Matthew Arnold and Their Influence on English Education (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1897).

28. Herbert W. Paul, Matthew Arnold (London: Macmillan and Co., 1907; 1st ed. 1902).

29. G. W. E. Russell, Matthew Arnold (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1904).

30. George Saintsbury, Matthew Arnold (New York: Dodd, Mead and Co., 1899), p. 118.

31. Herbert Spencer, The Study of Sociology (1st pub. 1873; Mich.: Ann Arbor Paperbacks, The University of Michigan Press, 1961).

32. In 1953, thirty-six years after the publication of Sherman's book Frederick L. Mulhauser placed Arnold midway between Carlyle, the believer "in aristocratic heroes and force" and Mill, the believer "in individual freedom and capacity." [Frederick L. Mulhauser, "Introduction" to Matthew Arnold, Selected Poetry and Prose (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1953), p. xvii].

33. Stuart P. Sherman, Matthew Arnold: How to Know Him (Indianapolis: The Bobbs-Merrill Co., 1917), pp. 225 et seq.

34. Irving Babbitt, "Matthew Arnold," Spanish Character and Other Essays (Boston and New York: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1940), p. 60.

35. Charles H. Harvey, Matthew Arnold: A Critic of the Victorian Period (London: James Clarke and Co., 1931), pp. 72-74; also pp. 174-175.

36. J. Dover Wilson, "Introduction" to Matthew Arnold, Culture and Anarchy, ed. Wilson (1st pub. 1932; Cambridge: Cambridge at the University Press, 1963), pp. xi-xii.

37. Leonard Woolf, After the Deluge: A Study of Communal Psychology, (London: The Hogarth Press, 1931), vol. 1, pp. 281-288.

38. Sir Ernest Barker, Political Thought in England 1848 to 1914, 2nd ed. (London: Oxford University Press, 1963; 1st ed. 1915), p. 175.

39. J. Dover Wilson, "Matthew Arnold and the Educationists," F.J.C. Hearnshaw, ed., The Social and Political Ideas of Some Representative Thinkers of the Victorian Age (London: Harrap and Co., 1933), p. 186.

40. Howard Mumford Jones, "Arnold, Aristocracy, and America," The American Historical Review 49, No. 3 (April 1944):403.

41. Harvey, Matthew Arnold, p. 214.

42. Benjamin Evans Lippincott, Victorian Critics of Democracy (Minneapolis: The University of Minnesota Press, 1938), pp. 94, 105, 133, 96, 95, 112.

43. Alexander Meiklejohn, Education Between Two Worlds (1st pub. 1942; New York: Books for Libraries Press, 1972), pp. 51-53.

44. Lionel Trilling, Matthew Arnold (New York: Norton, 1939).

45. Saintsbury, Matthew Arnold, p. 218.

46. Connell, Educational Thought.

47. Ibid., p. 275.

48. G.H. Bantock, "Matthew Arnold, H.M.I.," p. 103.

49. G.H. Bantock, "Matthew Arnold and Education," The Journal of Education 87, No. 1035 (October 1955):443.

50. G.H. Bantock, "The Best Self: Matthew Arnold," Studies in the History of Educational Theory, vol. 2, The Minds and the Masses 1760-1980 (London: George Allen and Unwin, 1984), pp. 199-221.

51. Raymond Williams, Culture and Society 1780-1950 (1st pub. 1958; London: Penguin Books, 1977), p. 136.

52. Ibid., p. 126.

53. Ibid., p. 134.

54. John Gross, The Rise and Fall of the Man of Letters (London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1969).

55. James Gribble, ed., Matthew Arnold (London: Collier Macmillan Limited, 1967).

56. Gaylord C. LeRoy, "Ambivalence in Matthew Arnold's Prose Criticism," College English, 13, No. 8 (May 1952):432-438; and Perplexed Prophets: Six Nineteenth-Century British Authors (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press for Temple University Publications, 1953).

57. Gribble, Matthew Arnold, p. 22.

58. Ibid., pp. 27, 30.

59. Kenneth Allott, Matthew Arnold (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1963), p. 64, note 1.

60. Fred G. Walcott, The Origins of Culture and Anarchy: Matthew Arnold and Popular Education in England (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1970), pp. 136-137.

61. P.J. Keating, "Arnold's Social and Political Thought," in Matthew Arnold: Writers and their Background, ed. Kenneth Allott (London: G. Bell and Sons, 1975), p. 208.

62. Ibid., pp. 234-235.

63. Patrick Brantlinger, The Spirit of Reform: British Literature and Politics, 1832-1867 (Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1977), p. 249.

64. R. Sheppard, "Two Liberals: A Comparison of the Humanism of Matthew Arnold and Wilhelm Von Humboldt," German Life and Letters, n.s., 24, No. 3 (April 1971):219-234.

65. Ibid., p. 233.

66. Patrick J. McCarthy, Matthew Arnold and the Three Classes (New York and London: Columbia University Press, 1964), pp. 76, 104, 81, 127, 137, 139, 173.

67. Geoffrey Carnall, "Matthew Arnold's 'Great Critical Effort,'" Essays in Criticism 8, No. 3 (July 1958):256-268.

68. George Watson, "Arnold and the Victorian Mind," Review of English Literature 8, No. 3 (July 1967):43.

69. Gross, Rise and Fall, p. 54; Keating, Social and Political Thought, p. 223; Michael Thorpe, Matthew Arnold (London: Evans Brothers, 1969), pp. 167-168.

70. J.D. Jump, Matthew Arnold (London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1955), p. 174.

71. J.D. Jump, "Matthew Arnold," Boris Ford, ed., From Dickens to Hardy, vol. 6, The New Pelican Guide to English Literature (Middlesex: Penguin Books, 1982), p. 327.

72. Valuable Studies in this regard include: Sidney M.B. Coulling, "The Evolution of 'Culture and Anarchy,'" Studies in Philology 60, No. 3 (July 1963):627-668; Sidney M.B. Coulling, Matthew Arnold and his Critics: A Study in Arnold's Controversies (Athens, Ohio: Ohio University Press, 1974); Martha Salmon Vogeler, "Matthew Arnold and Frederic Harrison: The Prophet of Culture and the Prophet of Positivism," Studies in English Literature 1500-1900 2, No. 4 (Autumn 1962):441-462.

73. Williams, Culture and Society, p. 128; Douglas Bush, Matthew Arnold: A Survey of his Poetry and Prose (New York: The Macmillan Co., 1971), p. 147; Thorpe, Matthew Arnold, pp. 149-150. See also

Gross, Rise and Fall, p. 46.

74. Fred G. Walcott, Origins, p. 144.

75. Gillian Sutherland, Matthew Arnold on Education (Middlesex: Penguin Education, 1973), p. 9.

76. Peter Smith and Geoffrey Summerfield, Matthew Arnold and the Education of the New Order (Cambridge: Cambridge at the University Press, 1969), pp. 1, 37.

77. Patrick Brantlinger, The Spirit of Reform: British Literature and Politics, 1832-1867 (Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1977), pp. 244, 254, 244.

78. T.M. Bamford, Rise of Public Schools (London: Thomas Nelson and Sons, 1967), p. 2.

79. Roy Fuller, "Philistines and Jacobins," The Sewanee Review 77, No. 4 (Autumn 1969):699.

80. Basil Willey, Nineteenth Century Studies: Coleridge to Matthew Arnold (1st pub. 1949; London: Chatto and Windus, 1964), p. 260.

81. Gross, Rise and Fall, p. 48.

82. Imelda Palmer, Matthew Arnold: Culture, Society and Education (Melbourne: Macmillan, 1979), pp. 72-73.

83. Curtis and Boultwood, Short History, p. 460.

84. Connell, Educational Thought, p. 169. Little has been written on Arnold's treatment of the curriculum although a number of scholars have considered in generalized terms his views of the respective merits of the humanities and science in the inculcation of his brand of "culture." Fred G. Walcott's article "Matthew Arnold and the Curriculum" was important for discussing Arnold's attitude towards science in the classroom. He denied that there was ever a major quarrel between Arnold and Huxley, contrary to popular opinion, over science, writing that, in fact, they were in general agreement, with Arnold always recognizing "the cultural power of science as a liberalizing study." [Fred G. Walcott, "Matthew Arnold and the Curriculum, Educational Theory 6, No. 1 (Jan. 1956):83]. In his 1970 work mentioned earlier Walcott dismissed the so-called quarrel between the two men as "nothing more than an amicable clarification, the shoring up of a basic agreement." (Walcott, Origins, p. 106). Similarly, Connell spoke of the confrontation as "Arnold's slight brush with his friend T. H. Huxley." (Connell, Educational Thought, p. 106). Douglas Cherry while agreeing that Arnold was in basic sympathy with Huxley nevertheless believed that the former favoured a literary approach to science teaching, an approach which would not expose the pupils to the "study of the 'processes' of science." [Douglas Cherry, "The Two Cultures of Matthew Arnold

and T.H. Huxley," Wascana Review 1, No. 1 (1966):60]. Earlier, H.V. Routh had written that despite Arnold's professed willingness to include a place for science in the "culture" which he advocated, it was the science of Goethe, not that of "Darwin, Huxley, Haeckel, or even Butler." [H.V. Routh, Towards The Twentieth Century: Essays in the Spiritual History of the Nineteenth Century (London: Cambridge at the University Press, 1937), p. 209]. Brantlinger considered that "culture" for Arnold connoted primarily literature and the humanities and that he felt it necessary to defend it "against the incursions of democracy and scientific skepticism." He observed that Arnold was much less aware than was Huxley of the need under the changing social and political conditions for a new democratic curriculum. (Brantlinger, Spirit of Reform, p. 247).

85. Palmer, Matthew Arnold, p. 48.

86. Ibid., pp. 85, 90. Other inconsistencies in Arnold's educational thought have been discussed by Gillian Sutherland and by D.M. Mason. [Sutherland, Matthew Arnold on Education, pp. 12-14; D.M. Mason, "Matthew Arnold and Elementary Education: A Reconsideration," History of Education 12, No. 3 (1983):177-189].

87. P.H. Butterfield, "Aspects of the Work of Matthew Arnold for Royal Commissions," British Journal of Educational Studies 15 (1967):284-291.

88. McCarthy, Matthew Arnold, pp. 87, 69-70.

89. Walcott, Origins.

90. Alexander P. Kelso, Matthew Arnold on Continental Life and Literature (Oxford: Blackwell, 1914); Frederic E. Faverty, Matthew Arnold the Ethnologist (Evanston: Illinois: Northwestern University Press, 1951).

91. Ibid., p. v.

92. Heinrich Straumann, "Matthew Arnold and the Continental Idea," Hugh Sykes Davies and George Watson, eds., The English Mind: Studies in the English Moralists Presented to Basil Willey (Cambridge: Cambridge at the University Press, 1964), pp. 240, 249.

93. F.J.W. Harding, Matthew Arnold: The Critic and France (Geneva: Libraire Droz, 1964), p. 178.

94. Campos even made the bad mistake of stating that Schools and Universities on the Continent (1868) was produced out of Arnold's 1859 trip to France for the Newcastle Commission; of course, it was written after his experiences abroad for the later Taunton Commission. [Christophe Campos, The View of France: From Arnold to Bloomsbury (London: Oxford University Press, 1965), p. 26].

CHAPTER TWO

MATTHEW ARNOLD, COMPARATIVE EDUCATOR

A) Arnold's Interest in the Continent

It is easy to demonstrate Arnold's fondness for the Continent and travel abroad which remained with him throughout his life, though, naturally, his attitudes respecting certain aspects of foreign life changed at different periods. Sometimes, however, his wish to travel abroad seems to have been due more to the desire of getting out of England and avoiding English society than to any intrinsic love of Continental life. As he wrote to his sister K (a pet name for his eldest sister, Jane Martha, who later became Mrs. W.E. Forster) in 1853 he intended to get away from all talk about the poems which he had published:

> I should like now, to go abroad--above all--to Rome, to live for some months quite quietly there--to see no English, and to hear nothing more about my Poems. It does me no good hearing the discussion of them--yet of course I cannot help being occupied by it. I intend soon to try and make some strong resolution in this respect--and keep it.[1]

In like manner, concern in 1854 that Louis Napoleon's activities in the Crimea would be detrimental to English interests depressed him to the extent that he wrote to his wife of his longing to live quietly in Switzerland with her and the boys.[2] However, going abroad was usually very congenial to Arnold because of his great interest in Continental society itself. He was very happy in 1859 to be appointed Foreign Assistant Commissioner to the Newcastle Commission to report on the elementary educational systems in various Continental nations. As he wrote to his youngest sister Fan: "I cannot tell you how much I like the errand, and, above all, to have the French district."[3] Being sent abroad was attractive for the respite it gave to Arnold from the tedious day-to-day work of school inspecting at home; still the lure of the Continent constituted a positive attraction in itself. We read in a letter of February 16, 1859 to his sister K (Jane Martha):

> I like the thoughts of the Mission more and more. You know that I have no special interest in the subject of public education [This is an odd remark, for he had by this been an H.M.I. for nearly eight years. However, his interest soon became extremely evident], but a mission like this appeals even to the general interest which every educated man cannot help feeling in such a subject. I shall for five months get free from the routine work of it, of which I sometimes get very sick, and be dealing with its history and principles. Then foreign life is still to me perfectly delightful, and LIBERATING in the highest degree, although I get more and more satisfied to live generally in England, and convinced that I shall work best in the long-run by living in the country which is my own. But when I think of the borders of the Lake of Geneva in May, and the narcissuses, and the lilies, I can hardly sit still.[4]

Similarly, he was pleased to be sent abroad again in 1865, this time as an Assistant Commissioner to the Taunton Commission. As he wrote on March 11, 1865, to his mother:

> You know how deeply the Continent interests me, and I have here an opportunity of seeing at comparative leisure, and with all possible facilities given me, some of the most important concerns of the most powerful and interesting States on the Continent. It is exactly what I wanted. I did NOT want to be a Commissioner, I did NOT want to be Secretary, but I DID want to go abroad, and to Germany as well as France.[5]

Twenty years later in 1885 he was once again happy to be sent to the Continent, this time as an emissary of the Education Department. He had clearly not lost his interest in foreign society and, more specifically, in foreign education for he wrote to his son Dick: "I should like it very much, because on one of these official tours one has the opportunity of learning so much."[6] Even when the Continent was brought to England Arnold expressed his pleasure, for he was quite content in 1869 to have the boy Prince of Genoa live as one of the Arnold family in England while he attended Harrow school: "The Continent has so much interest for me that I should not at all dislike this connexion with it."[7]

Arnold, as he himself acknowledged, was like his father in being "one of the true likers of the Continent."[8] Moreover, it was the Continent which helped him to place in particularly sharp focus what he felt to be the unsatisfactory nature of many aspects of English society. At any rate, much of the following work will be concerned with those writings which dealt with his perceptions of the inadequacies of English life especially when they were highlighted by the contrasting situation abroad. But first we turn to an examination of what he himself considered, though he wrote but little of a theoretical nature on this subject, to be the underlying purpose of undertaking comparative educational work and comparative studies in general. It will be pointed out that comparative education for Arnold had a specific and immediate purpose, namely the improvement of domestic educational conditions. But it will be stressed that this was only part of a wider, more expansive purpose of comparative studies in general, of which Arnold was a particularly fervent advocate, namely the imbuing with a more cultural, a more cosmopolitan, and a more European outlook what he considered to be his insular and provincial compatriots. Then follows a short account--it is necessarily short for he himself wrote little on the topic--of what he felt to be the appropriate methodologies to be employed by a practitioner of comparative education.

B) Arnold on the Nature and Purposes of Comparative Study

Viewing Arnold's work as a comparative educator with a narrow focus, or if the term be allowed on a micro level, it is clear that it involved learning about educational conditions in foreign societies, and borrowing appropriate aspects and adapting them for use in England, the prime motive being to improve domestic education. Of course, any study of other societies necessarily helps to illuminate one's own and Arnold would have argued that his wide experience of various aspects of Continental nations furnished him with a broader perspective of conditions in England than many of his insular compatriots who in their chauvinistic provinciality condemned much of the civilisation existing beyond the borders of their own nation. It should also be said that Arnold himself probably knew more than many others about a great diversity of aspects of his country since few Englishmen ~~had~~ travelled so extensively in England and had spoken to such a wide variety of his countrymen as did Arnold in the course of his H.M.I. duties. Also, it was this amalgam of knowledge about both his own and foreign countries which rendered him so useful as a comparative educator. One of his earliest utterances on the nature of comparative studies was contained in his 1857 inaugural lecture as Professor of Poetry at Oxford where he insisted that connexion is everywhere; no literature can be adequately understood when isolated from other events, other literatures; and he agreed with Prince Albert who urged the necessity of comparing the works of past ages with those of the present age and country in order that one might appreciate that older works also have great value. For, to Arnold true comprehension implies comparison: "To know how others stand, that we may know how we ourselves stand; and to know how we ourselves stand, that we may correct our mistakes and achieve our deliverance--that is our problem."[9] Thus, comparison is clearly very useful and, as he pointed out in the preface to his 1874 edition of the chapters on German education in Schools and Universities on the Continent, which he called Higher Schools and Universities in Germany, a study of foreign practices of necessity involves a criticism of one's own domestic practices: "Now a criticism of our way of acting, in any matter, is tacitly supplied by the practice of foreign nations, in a like matter, put side by side with our practice; and this criticism by actual examples is more practical, more interesting, and more readily attended to than criticism by speculative arguments."[10] In other words, the more one learns about another society, the more one knows about one's own. In like manner, as Arnold advised in "Disestablishment in Wales" (1888), one of the last pieces he wrote, whenever a remedy is sought for some unsatisfactory English practice, "it is well to know what is done elsewhere in the matters wherein our practice is alleged to be absurd and indefensible."[11] In this particular instance Arnold was thinking of the establishment of the Anglican Church in Wales and he turned to other nations, especially Germany, to examine how religion was publicly endowed and established there and to see whether such foreign practices had any lessons for Wales. However, he would presumably have been willing to allow the applicability of such an examination to other circumstances. For to

Arnold this was the essence of comparative studies: apply lessons learned from the study of another society to the improvement of one's own.

For example, in his important essay "Equality" (1878) Arnold, after discoursing on the equalitarian nature of French society (equalitarian compared to England, at any rate), declared that we should "see whether the considerations which we have been employing may not be of use to us about England."[12] It was this notion of examining foreign practices and borrowing and adapting them as required for use in England which was particularly manifest in Arnold's numerous writings on Continental education. Of course, the study of foreign educational systems had its own intrinsic value. As Arnold declared in the Preface to Schools and Universities on the Continent (1868), it is always useful to know foreign educational practices for their own sake: "Even where we have made up our minds as to the course which in this or that school matter we wish to adopt, it can do us no harm to see what is the course followed by the continental schools in this particular, and why they follow it."[13] He would have been the last to deny that knowledge for its own sake had its own worth. But it was its illumination of and applicability to the indigenous situation which was of especial importance. This, indeed, was the primary reason why Arnold himself and others were despatched abroad to report for the various Commissions.[14] Thus, in A French Eton (1864), a study of French secondary education, (not an official Report but stemming from his experiences during his work for the Newcastle Commission) he provided many facts in his discussion of a public lyceum and a private school, but the main importance of these facts lay in their application to the English educational scene: "What is the problem respecting secondary education which we in this country have to solve? What light do these facts throw upon that problem?"[15] In the General Conclusion to Schools and Universities on the Continent (1868) he remarked that the reader will probably expect some opinion to be offered respecting lessons which might be drawn from the study, and accordingly, he will attempt to provide such an opinion, "although I can hardly hope, perhaps, to communicate to him the weight of conviction with which I myself am left by what I have seen." Later, "I will sketch, guided by the comparative study of education which I have been enabled to make, the organisation of schools which seems to me required for this purpose." He concluded by stating that the outline sketch of the reorganisation of English instruction had been "suggested almost irresistibly by a study of public instruction in other European countries, and of the actual condition and prospects of the modern world."[16]

Naturally, he understood that not all foreign educational practices were good and that of those which were valuable some were more so than others. Assuredly, not everything which worked well in a foreign society would necessarily be adaptable to the English condition and be of benefit there. In like manner, societies changed over time and a nation which might at one period have had much to offer England's educational system might later on, with circumstances in one or both of the two nations altered, now have very little to offer for emulation. In the preface to Higher Schools and Universities in Germany (1874)

Arnold, though acknowledging that the development of French education had great historical interest, asserted that the English school system had now few practical lessons to learn from France. However, the schools and universities of Germany offered "an abundance of such lessons."[17] That Arnold was convinced of the great importance of comparative education was made clear in the preface to Schools and Universities on the Continent (1868) which contained his clearest and most definitive statement on the nature and purpose of comparative study, and especially comparative education:

> In short, it is expedient for the satisfactory resolution of these educational questions, which are at length beginning seriously to occupy us, both that we should attend to the experience of the Continent, and that we should know precisely what it is which this experience says. Having long held that nothing was to be learned by us from foreigners, we are at last beginning to see, that on a matter like the institution of schools, for instance, much light is thrown by a comparative study of their institution among other civilised states and nations. To treat this comparative study with proper respect, not to wrest it to the requirements of our inclinations or prejudices, but to try simply and seriously to find what it teaches us, is perhaps the lesson which we have most need to inculcate upon ourselves at present.[18]

Later in the same work Arnold wrote that a true understanding of popular education requires a comparative treatment: "This is a subject which can no more be known without being treated comparatively, than anatomy can be known without being treated comparatively."[19]

As has often been pointed out, Arnold was indeed in the main stream of 19th century comparative educators in advocating that England should borrow from foreign educational systems and transform the indigenous system by the introduction of Continental theories and practices. This was an important and manifestly practical purpose of comparative education. However, it can also be maintained that his motives as a comparativist were focused on much more than merely improving his country's educational structure. Certainly, he realised that in the more narrow sense comparative studies clearly implied the comparison of one thing with something else, of particular aspects of a foreign society with the equivalent aspects at home. However, the end goal of such comparison to Arnold was more than just discovering how in some particular a foreign society was superior to the home society and, accordingly, in attempting to improve the latter by borrowing from the former. While all this was indeed valuable, Arnold viewed comparative studies as possessing a broader and ultimately more useful purpose; comparison of foreign societies was to help in the inculcation of a wider and deeper perspective and in the development of a global awareness rather than a mere national one. For Arnold saw as a major concern of comparative studies to transform England, to bring her society, its spirit, in his opinion, narrow, provincial, insular, more into line with the prevailing Zeitgeist. He wished the English to become more cosmopolitan in outlook and practice; to become imbued with a greater feeling for international, as opposed to mere domestic, currents, particularly in intellectual life; to display, in short, an increased awareness that England, though important, still occupied only part of the world's stage. This desire to develop in his countrymen a greater understanding and appreciation of foreign societies and the realisation that there were many advantages which might fall to them from such an enlargement of spirit may be said to have constituted for Arnold a most significant function of comparative studies. For he was consistently at pains to pinpoint what he felt to be England's insularity and, at times, xenophobia and to stress that other nations had much to offer. In his 1864 essay "The Function of Criticism at the Present Time," originally delivered as a lecture from the Chair of Poetry at Oxford, he was quite categorical in his assertion that "By the very nature of things, as England is not all the world, much of the best that is known and thought in the world cannot be of English growth, must be foreign." Consequently, it was essential, he declared, that English critics of literature must be diligent in their study of foreign thought; this was in accordance with what he understood by criticism, namely "a disinterested endeavour to learn and propagate the best that is known and thought in the world, and thus to establish a current of fresh and true ideas."[20] [Arnold used very similar words to define his most important notion of "Culture" in the Preface(1869) to Culture and Anarchy and in the Preface to the first edition (1873) of Literature and Dogma.[21]] This "in the world" was important, for he was insistent that the critic must cast his nets wider than his own country. Such comparative criticism, he felt, would not only help to improve England's literature but it would also enable her to lose her narrowness and provinciality, and to realise that there were many things of value to be learned from other societies.

One can adduce many reasons why Arnold stood apart from the typical Victorian, but one of the chief of them was his fervent desire to break down the barriers set up by a blinkered nationalism, even chauvinism, and to inculcate in his countrymen what was in effect the notion of Europeanism. There is no doubt but that Arnold himself was essentially a European or Continental thinker as opposed to a mere English one and that this was the natural result of his extensive comparative studies carried out in literature as well as in actual foreign travel and practical experience. Basil Willey mentions his "European outlook" while Warren Anderson writes of "his truly European field of reference," stating that "within the chosen limits of his Europeanism" Arnold strongly exemplified the Greek saying that the whole world is the wise man's native land.[22] It is certainly true that though at first sight the quintessential upper middle class Englishman, Arnold from his early manhood left behind the insularity and self-congratulatory attitude of the typical compatriot of his class. As early as May 1848 there was evident in a letter to his sister K (Jane Martha) both his manifest concern with England's declining condition and his belief that in the future European nation states would draw together: "I am not sure but I agree in Lamartine's prophecy that 100 years hence the Continent will be a great united Federal Republic, and England, all her colonies gone, in a dull steady decay."[23] He expressed this notion of a united Europe in a more explicit form in "The Function of Criticism at the Present Time" (1864), where he was attempting to define the sort of criticism with which he was most concerned: "a criticism which regards Europe as being, for intellectual and spiritual purposes, one great confederation, bound to a joint action and working to a common result; and whose members have, for their proper outfit, a knowledge of Greek, Roman, and Eastern antiquity, and of one another." Moreover, the modern nation, he considered, which would make most progress in the intellectual and spiritual realm would be the one keeping most closely to this programme.[24] Arnold used almost the same words about a great confederation of civilised nations fifteen years later in 1879 in his essay on Wordsworth, stating that this was Goethe's ideal and that it was an ideal which modern societies would dwell upon more and more.[25] Again, in On the Study of Celtic Literature (1866) he referred to the tendency of Europe to become increasingly a unified community with people becoming Europeans rather than being merely Englishmen, Frenchmen, Germans, Italians.[26] In "My Countrymen" (1866) he wrote that the French nation "had always a vision of a sort of federation of the States of Europe under the primacy of France." However, this was not the sort of federation which he desired; rather, the progress of the world "no doubt lies in the direction of more concert and common purpose among nations, but these nations free, self-impelled, and living each its own life."[27] Arnold also distinguished a type of thought which he labelled European as opposed to the thought of any one particular nationality, writing in his essay "Theodore Parker" (1867): "At this time of day it is not enough to be an American voice, or an English voice, or a French voice; for a real spiritual lead it is necessary to be a European voice."[28] Such European thought connoted modernity, and the ability of transcending national borders. With respect to religion, Arnold wrote in his Preface to Last Essays on Church and Religion (1877) that

> when we consider the immense change which, in other matters where tradition and convention were the obstacles to change, has befallen the thought of this country since the Continent was opened at the end of the great war [the war against France during the time of the Revolution and Napoleon], we cannot doubt that in religion, too, the mere barriers of tradition and convention will finally give way, that a common European level or thought will establish itself, and will spread to America

also.[29]

The view of the cultural and broadening intellectual influence of European thought was also found in his April 8, 1875 letter, entitled "Roman Catholics and the State," to the Pall Mall Gazette. Here he criticised what he considered to be political, social, intellectual and moral inconveniences in Catholicism, namely its Ultramontanism, its confessional, its rejection of private judgement. But he realised that there was no way that these inconveniences could suddenly disappear or be quickly got rid of; this could happen: "only by the general widening and clearing of European thought being felt through this community."[30] To be European, for Arnold, implied being broadly educated, being the possessor of true culture, having a wide and humane vision, all attributes in which he felt the vast majority of his countrymen to be wanting. Joseph de Maistre, for example, was deemed by Arnold to be "European," and more so than Edmund Burke, one of his great heroes.[31] Another who was said to be "European" was Eugène Colladon, a Genevese judge, who had received a traditional education in the Classics and in French, an education which produced "a stamp of something widely human, European and central, in comparison with which the intellectual modes of other nations appeared provincial and arbitrary, and in which lies the secret of the strong attraction exercised by the French language and culture."[32]

Though in the prefatory essay to his 1878 edition of Johnson's Lives of the Poets Arnold wrote that England had passed from an antiquated and peculiar type of thought and expression to one which was modern and European [33], he at most other times denied the attribute of

"European" to his own nation. Rather England was distinguished more by her "insularity and eccentricity"[34], and much of her literature, he felt, was "thoroughly and intensely PROVINCIAL, not European."[35] Admittedly, Arnold considered that his father "was so wonderfully, for his nation, time, and profession, European, and thus so got himself out of the narrow medium in which, after all, his English friends lived."[36] But in Arnold's view there would be few Englishmen now in his own day who would have much in common with Dr. Arnold, he who had learned German to read Barthold Niebuhr and so keep abreast of the advances in modern German scholarship. For the typical Englishman of the second half of the Nineteenth Century, he felt, rested smugly in his insularity and provinciality. But this was why comparative studies were considered to be of such particular importance. For the most efficacious and quickest way, in Arnold's opinion, for the English to become more European and by so doing lose their inward-regarding disposition, gain more culture, and develop upon more modern lines was to pay greater attention to the Continent and to attend to some of the dominant influences there. It was essential for them to recognise that the exalted days of Wellington and Waterloo, when their country stood alone in all her glory, were gone for ever and that there were now other nations occupying important places on the world stage, from whom there was much to be learned.

In fine, Arnold saw two complementary purposes in comparative studies. At a more narrow or micro level such studies had the distinct purpose of focusing on foreign practices in specific areas and illuminating where such practices were clearly superior to those in England, so that appropriate borrowings and adaptations might be made in order to improve the situation at home. For example, even a brief perusal of Arnold's comparative educational writings will reveal his staunch conviction that above all other Continental theories and practices it was certain educational ones, particularly those pertaining to State or public educational provision, which would be most useful for emulation in his own nation. Comparative educational studies were clearly ameliorative in purpose. But amelioration was also a manifest purpose of all comparative studies, in Arnold's view, when they were considered at a wider or macro level. Such studies were to improve the English mentality by breaking down attitudes of insularity, provincialism, ill-conceived chauvinism, and xenophobia and by developing a much broader, more European, and, indeed, a more modern way of thought. Comparison of as many features as possible of other societies with one's own would be a powerful means in the inculcation of that true culture which Arnold saw as the main goal of education.

C) Arnold on the Methodology of Comparative Education

Vociferous debate frequently occurs today among practitioners of comparative education concerning just what exactly the study of comparative education consists of, what precise limitations might be applied to its scope and, a favourite source of dissension, whether it should be categorised as an art, a science or, in fact, a distinct discipline at all. Perhaps, though it is a moot point, we are nearer some consensus regarding these questions today than was the case a number of years ago but over a century ago when Arnold was embroiled in his comparative educational endeavours these topics by no means engendered the same enthusiasm and interest if, indeed, they were considered at all. Apart from the obvious intrinsic interest of learning about the practices of some aspect of a foreign society there was invariably unanimous agreement that at least the primary purpose of conducting comparative educational research was to utilise the results to improve conditions in the domestic society. Nor was there much debate last century among comparative educators concerning the various merits and demerits of different types of methodology to be employed in the research. One simply got on with the job of examining foreign educational practices, talking with foreign educators and administrators, and reading up whatever was written on the subject. It clearly helped if the comparative educator was well versed in the corresponding educational practices of his own country--Arnold, of course, was thoroughly experienced in many aspects of English education but not all practitioners in the field of comparative education had as much practical knowledge about their own educational system. In any event, we should not expect too much theoretical discussion from Arnold concerning what methodology or methodologies are to be favoured in the undertaking of comparative educational work. Still, he by no means considered that all such work should be amateurish or hit and miss in nature. On the contrary, he did offer some interesting pointers which he clearly regarded as of importance for any satisfactory dealings in comparative education.

Considering the troubled question of Home Rule for Ireland Arnold declared that confusion results when we draw inapplicable analogies from far off and unlike countries. Application can only be made when we take our analogy from a more similar society somewhat closer to home, which bears a similar relationship to that of Ireland with England. In this particular instance Arnold took as an example Provence and its relation to France.[37] This advice also holds true for the comparative study of education. In The Popular Education of France (1861) Arnold justified the selection of the country of the title, declaring that with respect to population, extent, resources, it was not ill-matched with England. The general problems of popular education were quite similar in both countries and Arnold clearly considered that the study of such education of the "great French people, so like to us in its numbers, so like to us in its power, so like to us in its difficulties" would prove of use to England also.[38] However, in the Introduction to the above work Arnold also made the useful observation that it is wise to bear in mind the differences between nations:

> It seems to me, then, that one may save one's self from much idle terror at names and shadows if one will be at the pains to remember what different conditions the different character of two nations must necessarily impose on the operation of any principle. That which operates noxiously in one may operate wholesomely in the other; because the unsound part of the one's character may be yet further inflamed and enlarged by it, the unsound part of the others may find in it a corrective and an abatement. This is the great use which two unlike characters may find in observing each other. Neither is likely to have the other's faults so each may safely adopt as much as suits him of the other's qualities. [39]

In any event, when the country to which comparison is being made is chosen, it is essential for the comparativist to find the facts and treat them objectively; they are not to be used cavalierly to suit some shifting purpose. When we compare the instruction of English schools with that of American ones, "let us have the real facts about these schools, and do not let us warp the facts because we admire the political and social system of America."[40] For any true interpretation the facts must be given as they really are. That is why Arnold took issue with John Morley on the subject of who was charged with religious instruction in Prussian public elementary schools. Morley had declared that it was the minister of the parish who taught religion in these schools. Arnold retorted that this notion was "astounding"; on the contrary, religious instruction was imparted by the teacher. It was only to the dissenting minority who were removed from the majority at the time of such teaching that the minister taught religion.[41] Furthermore, Arnold is generally more to be trusted on such factual matters as he more than most Englishmen had first hand experience of foreign educational systems and had studied such systems in depth.

In a review article, "German and English Universities," published in 1868, a few months after Schools and Universities on the Continent, Arnold wrote that an individual who turns his attention for the first time to an examination of foreign schools and universities "needs much practice and much experience before he rightly learns what to look at and how to look at it."[42] Already in Schools and Universities on the Continent (1868) he had declared that though he had visited several Continental girls' schools, such "schools well merit a separate enquiry, and by an enquirer who has first thoroughly acquainted himself, as I have not, with the working of our girls' schools at home."[43] A comparative educator needs to have good experience and be well informed before embarking on any study. Writing in A French Eton (1864) he declared that foreign schools "must be seen at work, and seen by experienced eyes, for their operation to be properly understood and described."[44] Nevertheless, he acknowledged the difficulty for a foreigner to understand how things really stand in another country--"a foreigner cannot well have a thorough knowledge of the circumstances."[45] Still, a comparative student will be incapable of understanding the facts of a foreign situation unless he actually travels there and studies the question at first hand. That is why in the 1868 Preface to Schools and Universities on the Continent he criticised James Fraser and Canon J.P. Morris for their assertion that English inspected schools were at least as good as the best foreign primary schools, if not better. Arnold dismissed this opinion as having little substance, for Fraser and Morris, unlike Arnold himself, had not seen with their own eyes the best Dutch, Swiss, and North German primary schools; rather, they spoke "from report, or from the pleasant impressions they have received from English inspectors with whom they have come in contact, or from their warm admiration of the Revised Code."[46] Their lack of on-the-spot, first-hand acquaintance with the schools had rendered them incapable of getting at the real facts and Arnold was quite categoric in his assertion that "No ability or experience in the judge who pronounces on these matters can make up for his not knowing the facts."[47] Arnold would have given more weight to Fraser's statements if he had actually visited these Continental schools, as he had indeed visited American schools for the Schools Inquiry Commission. However, at present both he and others seemed "to lie under a sort of disadvantage in giving their judgement for the one of two things, without having seen the other."[48]

In addition, Arnold argued that a person undertaking comparative studies in education should not be satisfied in merely interviewing the appropriate educational officials abroad. He implied in The Popular Education of France (1861) that there is a danger of such a person wasting his time in imparting information rather than gathering it. He himself spent little time discussing the question of Dutch and English pupil-teachers with his friends among the French Inspectors, for "I was in France that I might learn what they knew, and not that I might teach them what I knew."[49] Indeed, he believed that nothing can compensate for on the spot examination and experience of the actual classroom situation by the individual making a study of foreign educational systems. As he wrote in his 1886 Special Report on Certain Points Connected with Elementary Education in Germany, Switzerland, and France: "The best test, however, of school work is afforded, in my opinion, by what one oneself sees and hears the scholars do; for that reason I looked upon it as the essential part of my business to be as much as possible in the classes while they were at work, and I spent there every hour I could."[50] Furthermore, Arnold seemed to favour, authorities permitting, the practice of making unscheduled unannounced visits to foreign schools; presumably, one can gain more spontaneous and realistic impressions of the schools when the children and the teachers are not primed in advance in anticipation of a visit. At any rate, he declared that he would not have exchanged the visit made without notice to several schools at Blanquefort, near Bordeaux, for a week of visits chosen by the local inspectors.[51]

Allied to the importance for the comparative educator of ascertaining the real facts of the situation is the need to understand how terms applied to education often differ with respect to their meaning on the Continent and in England. Frequently the usage of terms in comparative studies is ambiguous or even inaccurate. In this respect, Arnold considered the secretary of the National Society who maintained that in 1858 the proportion of scholars to population was 1 to 7.7 in England and Wales, 1 to 8.11 in Holland, 1 to 9 in France, and 1 to 6.27 in Prussia and who, accordingly, concluded that his own country was ahead of Holland and France and respectably close to Prussia.[52] Arnold, however, took issue with what he viewed as the fallacy underlying the application of the word "scholar," for this word signified something qualitatively different in, on the one hand, Continental nations and, on the other, England. For, on the Continent, "scholar" was much more rigorously and narrowly defined than in England; many were counted as scholars in England who would not be so counted on the Continent. Consequently, for comparative purposes, the proportion of 1 to 7 was not the true one. The English usage of the term "scholar," Arnold considered, though likely acceptable when used solely in an English context was "obviously illusive when we are comparing school-returns with the foreigners, who do not regard quantity of scholars merely, but who regard quality also."[53] Arnold went on to consider statistics provided by certain foreigners relating to the educational attainment of recruits in the respective armies of Prussia, France, and England which they alleged showed the inadequacy of English popular education compared with its Continental counterpart. They revealed that the proportion of illiterate recruits in the Prussian army was only 2 per cent, 27 per cent in the French army, and as high as 57 per cent in the English army. However, Arnold declared that even if these statistics were trustworthy, the comparative educational level of the recruits was not an accurate test to draw conclusions concerning the relative standard of popular education in the three countries because of the recruiting practices of the English army. Indeed, he was even pessimistic about the value of comparative study generally, declaring it to be probable that "with the sort of civil administration we possess, and are proud of possessing, we cannot obtain the means of accurately comparing our popular education with that of the Continent."[54] But, at any rate one should be very careful about placing too much confidence in an inaccurate comparison. In his 1873 "A Speech at Westminster" Arnold returned to the dangers in drawing comparisons from countries having different understandings of different terms. He pointed to the notion of "higher education" which might have a different connotation in America than in England, the Americans understanding by it something on a rather lower level.[55]

D) Arnold's Reports on Foreign Educational Systems

The observations of Arnold in his role as a comparativist of foreign educational systems vis-à-vis the system in England bear close scrutiny. As we have seen, few Englishmen had as much experience as did Arnold both in English education and in that of a number of Continental nations. His decades as a H.M.I. in England and Wales and his experiences as an Assistant Commissioner for the Newcastle and the Taunton Commissions as well as an emissary for the Education Department in 1885-1886 rendered him an authority in these matters such as few could emulate. As a contemporary and fellow inspector of schools, Sir Joshua Fitch, wrote, Arnold "brought to the study of all educational problems an enlightened judgment and a power of comparison possible to very few."[56] A modern critic, F.J.W. Harding, wrote that "he may now be regarded as a true pioneer in the field of comparative education and a leading authority on French education in the nineteenth century."[57] In any event, Arnold early became a eulogistic supporter of many aspects of foreign education while at the same time a fervent critic of what he felt to be the general inadequacy of the educational provision in England, especially at the secondary level. Of course, he did not praise everything connected with education abroad, nor was he blind to the many good points of the situation in England. Nevertheless, his comparative studies made him adamant that England could learn much from her Continental neighbours in the educational sphere; appropriate borrowing and adaptation could be highly ameliorative.

In the remainder of this chapter are introduced some of the more prominent observations, particularly those dealing with the role of the State in the educational affairs of Continental nations, made in the Reports stemming from Arnold's three official trips abroad as well as in A French Eton (1864), not an official Report, as we have pointed out, but a work directly inspired by his experiences as an Assistant Commissioner to the Newcastle Commission in 1859. It is by no means the case that these four works account for all of Arnold's utterances on foreign education, but they are the longest and most singularly focused of his comparative educational works. Naturally, reference will be made in subsequent chapters to Arnold's many other relevant writings in his prolific oeuvre.

i) Arnold's THE POPULAR EDUCATION OF FRANCE

On January 25, 1859 Matthew Arnold was invited to become an Assistant Commissioner to the Newcastle Commission appointed the previous June "to consider and report what Measures, if any, are required for the Extension of sound and cheap elementary Instruction to all Classes of the People." He accepted and for most of the period from March 15 to August 26, 1859 (the first fortnight in August was spent in Dover) he was engaged in examining schools and their organisation in France, the French cantons of Switzerland, and Holland, a six month spell which was, as Patrick J. McCarthy writes, "one of the great illuminating periods of his life."[58] There was a delay before the actual Newcastle Report was published--it did not appear until April 1861. A few weeks later, in early May, Arnold separately published under Longman his own contribution to the Report, giving it the title of The Popular Education of France. This work is highly important for providing an insight into Arnold's early views on political, social, and educational conditions in a number of countries of Continental Europe and also for understanding just how he considered his comparative experiences could be of benefit to his own country.

Much of Arnold's exegesis of elementary education in France was historical, for he provided brief accounts of the situation existing before the Revolution, and then in succeeding chapters, of that under the Revolution, under the First Empire, under the Restoration, under the Monarchy of July, 1830, under the Revolution of 1848 and the Second Empire. When he reached his own day Arnold, after first devoting a chapter to the contemporary material and financial condition of French elementary education, turned to an examination of the present intellectual and moral condition of, respectively, schools in Paris, schools in the provinces, normal schools. Chapters XIII and XIV were mainly concerned with a comparison between the popular education of France and that of England, the former dealing with legislation, the latter with the results on the people. However, the comparative element was not confined to these two chapters, for in many of the other chapters he compared aspects of English with those of French education.

Now, as the main interest of this study is concerned with Arnold's discussion of both foreign and English systems of middle class or secondary education not much time will be spent in considering his conclusions respecting elementary education; but, of course, this level of education was the main focus in his report for the Newcastle Commission. Nevertheless, it is important to stress his praise of the involvement of the State in the elementary educational systems of foreign nations. For if there was one dominant lesson which Arnold took from abroad it was the necessity of introducing into England a thorough State educational system covering all levels. The appalling condition of the vast majority of existing English secondary schools, all of which were completely private, could only be improved by State involvement on the Continental model. But a State system of schools at the secondary level must rest on a thorough public elementary system, also designed on the Continental model, and there must be good coordination between the different levels. However, though the State in England had commenced--in a very small way it must be stressed--its participation at the lower level in 1833, at the time of the Newcastle Commission Report (1861) it lagged very far behind a number of foreign nations in providing for elementary schooling.

At any rate, Arnold was very impressed with aspects of the French public elementary system, and brief mention must be made of some of the conclusions resulting from his examination of it. Above all else he was favourably disposed to its treatment of the religious question, "a question which meets every system of education upon the threshold,"[59] and one which was the bane of English elementary education. He knew only too well from his experiences at home of the existence of sects with their irreconcilable differences and the ravages they were liable to wreak, a knowledge which produced the ecumenical wish that it would unquestionably be a good thing "if there reigned everywhere one truly catholic religious faith, embracing all the faithful in a common bond."[60] But France differed from England in distinguishing and in marking off those which she considered to be the modern state's necessary and irreconcilable religious divisions and leaving the others which were not incurably separate to combine. The result was that she recognised only three divisions--Protestantism, Roman Catholicism, and Judaism; the French State "recognises these, but it recognises no other. In an empire of thirty-six millions it recognises no other."[61] But the situation in Great Britain with its population of twenty-one million was quite different, for here as many as seven incompatible religious divisions were recognised: Roman Catholicism and the

Protestantism of, respectively, Anglicanism, Wesleyanism, Methodism, the Orthodox Church of Scotland, the Free Church of Scotland, the Episcopalian Church of Scotland, the Biblicalism of the British and Foreign School Society. But, declared Arnold, if Britain followed the example of France it would limit itself to at most four essentially distinct denominations--Anglicanism, non-Anglican Protestantism, Roman Catholicism, and Judaism. Furthermore, as there was no State religion in France the civil power kept itself impartial with respect to the denominations; when there were dealings between the State and the religious divisions the former did "not make itself denominational," rather the latter were obliged "to make themselves national."[62] Accordingly, it owed "no account to any man of the religious persuasion of its inspectors: for it is not as religious sectaries they have to discharge their duties, but as civil servants; and the moment they begin to discharge them as religious sectaries, they discharge them ill." But in England the inspectors were of the same religion as the schools they inspected: "...the State makes itself denominational with the denominations....It does not hold itself aloof from the religious divisions of the population; it enters into them."[63]

Furthermore, the provision of schools under the English system was considered by Arnold to be inferior to the French in that the English had "by no means undertaken to put the means of education within the people's reach, but only to make the best and richest elementary schools better and richer." He made mention of three types of system. When the system in effect was one of voluntaryism, schools were not set up where they were most needed. When the system was one where the State had complete control, much money was wasted and at the local level there was apathy. Finally, when the system left all to the parish there was much unwillingness to spend money. But there was a balance between the three systems in the modern French plan for the provision of public elementary schools. This

> plan places its schools chiefly, but not absolutely, in the hands of local boards; it tempers the parsimony of the parish with the more liberal views of the central power; and between the parish contributor and the State contributor it places a third contributor of less narrow spirit than the first, of more economical spirit than the second,--the Department or County.[64]

Though French teachers and inspectors were generally paid less than their English counterparts Arnold acknowledged that this was only to be expected of the vast scale of the French system. But he had much praise for the French organisation of inspection, most of which, despite the presence of a little redundancy, he declared to be "excellent." It was also an organisation which was very different to that found in England and his keen appreciation of it led him to list the four inadequacies of the English system which were most prominent according to the opinion of the most reliable judges with whom he met on his trip abroad:

> first, the want of district-centres for managing the current details of school business, and the consequent inundation of our London office with the whole of them; secondly, the inconceivable prohibition to our primary inspectors to inspect without previous notice; thirdly, the denial of access into the ranks of the primary inspectors to the most capable public schoolmasters; fourthly, and above all, the want of inspectors-general.[65]

Moreover, earlier in the Report Arnold stated that not only were French public schools open to inspection by the State, all private schools were also. But the inspection of private schools, as laid down in the law of March 1850, was only concerned with morality, hygiene, salubrity; it did not extend to school instruction. The reason for this was that the inspector had no power to have inadequacies in the sphere of instruction in French private schools changed. However, it was ordained that even in private schools every teacher must hold the certificate of capacity without which no one in France was allowed teach. So the French did not permit as teachers, in any of their schools, public or private, those incompetent individuals whom one so often found teaching in English schools. However, Arnold stated that French private boys' schools, lay or religious--the case was different for nuns' private girls' schools--even though their teachers must be judged capable, were not as popular with parents as the public schools because of the latters' more public character and stricter inspectoral system.[66]

Perhaps the most significant aspect of Arnold's account of French popular education for the Newcastle Commission was his opinion of the important effect the State by its school-legislation had produced upon the temper and intelligence of the French population. The State itself was a good educator: "What I say is, that on certain capital points the State in France has by its legislation and administration exercised a directly educative influence upon the reason and equity of its people, and that of this influence the mental temper of the French people does actually show the fruits."[67] He directly praised the French school-legislation: "by its form and by its contents, by its letter and by its spirit, by its treatment of reason and by its treatment of prejudice, in what it respects and in what it does not respect, the school-legislation of modern France fosters, encourages, and educates the popular intelligence and the popular equity."[68]

Arnold considered France to be a nation great in many respects, as also he did England. However, he felt that it was undeniable that their respective systems of education were radically different. France had a national system, admittedly with an unpretentious low level of instruction but it was a level which France's sure progress would inevitably raise. It was also a system which did not cater to the unreason or intolerance of the masses but one which actively sought to improve their reason and equity. England, on the other hand, did not have a national system and though much had been accomplished for superior primary instruction, very little had yet been done for elementary primary instruction. Moreover, Arnold argued that there were grave objections against making this elementary instruction national. He was not here rejecting one of his most cherished wishes for England's education. Rather, he considered that before elementary instruction was made national a number of major changes had to be made to the existing structure.[69] For he thought it

> a grave objection, that the system is over-centralised--that it is too negligent of local machinery--that it is inordinately expensive. It is a graver, that to make it national would be to make national a system not salutary to the national character in the very points where that character most needs a salutary corrective; a system which, to the loud blasts of unreason and intolerance, sends forth no certain counterblast; which submissively accompanies the hatefulest and most barren of all kinds of dispute, religious dispute, into its smallest channels;--stereotypes every crotchet, every prejudice, every division, by recognising it, and suggests to its recipients no

> higher rationality than it finds in them.[70]

Certainly Arnold greatly desired increased State involvement in education in England--in fact, it was one of his most strongly held prescriptions for ensuring the nation's well-being and progress--but he was at the same time quite convinced that a State system could only succeed if thorough changes were also made in such areas, among others, as the structure of local government and the religious question.

By far the largest part of Arnold's report for the Newcastle Commission was concerned with the elementary education of France. However, he was also charged with examining the systems in use in Holland as well as Switzerland's French Cantons of Geneva, Vaud, Fribourg, Neufchâtel, and the Valais. With regard to Switzerland, suffice it to say that he was generally favourable towards the role of the State in this connection--"It is needless to say that this public school system is under the control of the State."[71] Arnold spent about a fortnight in Holland in June 1859 visiting The Hague, Amsterdam, Zaandam, Haarlem, Utrecht, and Rotterdam. He was certainly pleased with what he saw of Dutch primary schools declaring that he had witnessed no other schools elsewhere at this level worthy to be compared to those of Holland.[72] He spoke of "the present excellent situation of primary instruction," and declared that though Prussian schools might be diffused more widely, however only in Holland had primary schools "such thorough soundness and solidity."[73] Nevertheless, for the purposes of comparing them with English schools Arnold stated that he did not have a lively interest in them since the general circumstances of Holland and England, though alike in certain respects, were for the most part essentially different. Still, he was very favourably impressed by the municipalities' providing for and watching over the nation's schools and though he stated in his report that he did not hope that municipalities in England could act in a like manner, he later on in many other writings argued for a great increase in the provision and power of local government in England. It is likely that Holland helped to mould his views. But above everything else it was the role of the State in education in Holland as well as in France and Switzerland with which Arnold was most taken during his work for the Newcastle Commission and he was of the firm opinion that England also should emulate such State action:

> Even the Government of Holland, however, has regulated popular education by law; even the school-loving people of Holland, so well taught, so sober-minded, so reasonable, is not abandoned in the matter of its education to its own caprices. The State in Holland, where education is prized by the masses, no more leaves education to itself, than the State in France, where it is little valued by them. It is the same in the other country of which I have described the school-system--in Switzerland. Here and there we may have found, indeed, school-rules in some respects injudicious, in some respects extravagant; but everywhere we have found law, everywhere State-regulation. English readers will judge for themselves, whether there is anything which makes the State, in England, unfit to be trusted with such regulation; whether there is anything which makes the people in England unfit to be subjected to it.[74]

ii) Arnold's A FRENCH ETON

In 1865 Arnold went abroad once again as an Assistant Commissioner, this time for the Taunton Commission which was inquiring into middle class education, namely secondary and higher education. However, he had already seen something of a number of Continental secondary schools, public and private, when engaged on business for the Newcastle Commission, and he had briefly mentioned his experiences in his report. In 1864 he published in pamphlet form A French Eton, originally published as three articles during the previous months for Macmillan's Magazine, which constituted an important contribution to the debate on secondary education in England. The Clarendon Commission had been appointed in July 1861 and charged with reporting on the state of England's great Public Schools, but A French Eton was concerned with the secondary education of a much larger class of English children, namely those of the extensive middle class, and not just those of the relatively few very rich families who sent their scions to the small number of the Public Schools being examined by Clarendon.

In his report for the Newcastle Commission Arnold stated that he could do no more than touch on the topic of secondary education because of the limits imposed by his main subject, namely elementary education. Yet he felt that he must at least mention it for he saw something of it and he made many inquiries about it. If he had not studied it he would have gained but an imperfect knowledge of French primary education. The secondary education which Arnold found in existence in France dated from the law of May 1, 1802. There were 63 lyceums and 244 communal colleges each "inspected by the State, aided by the State, drawing from this connection with the State both efficiency and dignity; and to which, in concert with the State, the departments, the communes, private benevolence, all cooperate to provide free admission for poor and deserving scholars."[75] Before the involvement of the State, considered Arnold, the vast French middle class had inadequate schools and if the State had not interfered they would not have been able to provide better schools by their own means. But now, the State having interfered,

> this class enjoys better schools for its children, not than the great and rich enjoy (that is not the question) but than the same class enjoys in any country where the State has not interfered to found them. The lyceums may not be so good as Eton or Harrow; but they are a great deal better than a CLASSICAL AND COMMERCIAL ACADEMY.[76]

Public secondary education for the French was clearly better, in Arnold's opinion, than most of the private secondary education available in England.

Near the beginning of A French Eton (1864) Arnold wrote that one must cross the Channel in order to see good secondary education as a national concern and catering to the large numbers of pupils needing it. He decried the fact that the Clarendon Commission (1861-64) had not had it as part of its mandate to make a thorough examination of Continental secondary education, declaring that qualified individuals should have been sent abroad to study foreign schools in the Commission's name. For in order to understand and describe foreign institutions properly they must be seen at first hand in actual operation by a person experienced in such matters.[77] As we have seen Arnold held that this constituted a basic requirement for any genuine comparative educational work. He himself was such a qualified person and, as stated, during his study of French elementary schools in 1859 he saw something of French secondary education, specifically the Lyceum, or public secondary school, at Toulouse, and also the private secondary school at Soreze under the direction of Father Lacordaire, an institution not of the State-pattern.

There was a lyceum, Arnold reported in A French Eton (1864), in the main town of every French department and a communal college in all the considerable towns. The former was founded and maintained by the State and aided by the department and commune; the latter was founded and maintained by the commune, with State aid.[78] But private secondary schools in France such as that at Soreze were by no means totally free from State control. It was impossible to open a private school without first seeking the consent of the public authorities which would not be granted unless they were satisfied with the premises of the proposed school and the necessary certificate of probation and certificate of competency of the school's director. To gain these two certificates an individual must have served in a secondary school for five years and passed the public examination for secondary teachers. In addition, a private school was always liable to be inspected by State authorities to examine the living conditions of the pupils and to check that nothing was being taught which was contrary to public morality and the law. If the inspector's report was adversely critical and was accepted, the school could be closed.[79] Arnold gave a brief discourse on the actual physical conditions, the teaching, and other diverse aspects of the Toulouse Lyceum and Lacordaire's school at Soreze; however it is outside the scope of the present inquiry to delve deeply into his account here. Suffice it to say that in general he was favourably impressed by the two schools during his examination of them in 1859. This was an impression which he was once again to receive of French secondary education, public and private, during his investigation six years later for the Taunton Commission. Moreover, as there was great homogeneity among State schools in France his assessment of the Toulouse Lyceum might serve as a reasonable indication of the state of France's 62 other lyceums also. He stressed this homogeneity of France's lyceums and communal colleges in his report for Taunton:

> He who has seen one LYCÉE or communal college in France, I will not say has seen all, but at any rate may consider that he can form for himself a pretty accurate notion of all. In all, the course of studies is very nearly the same, following programmes drawn up by authority. In all, the books used are very nearly the same, specified in a list drawn up by authority. In all, the professors and principal functionaries of every kind are appointed by the Minister of Public Instruction, and can be dismissed by him. In all, the arrangement and training of classes, the arrangements for boarding, the hours of work and recreation, the means of recreation, the mode of government, and the whole system of discipline, are the same.[80]

Earlier, in The Popular Education of France (1861) Arnold had concluded "that schools in France differed one from another much less than schools in England."[81]

At any rate, in A French Eton Arnold declared that he had presented certain facts respecting a French State secondary school and a French private secondary school, and it was now necessary to apply these facts. In short, he wished to ascertain what these facts signified about the problem of secondary education in England. Again, it is clear that his main motive as a comparative educator was to apply lessons learned from his experiences abroad to the task of ameliorating the defects of the educational system in England. The pivotal question he posed was:

> For the serious thinker, for the real student of the question of secondary instruction, the problem

> respecting secondary instruction which we in England have to solve is this:--Why cannot we have throughout England--as the French have throughout France, as the Germans have throughout Germany, as the Swiss have throughout Switzerland, as the Dutch have throughout Holland--schools where the children of our middle and professional classes may obtain, at the rate of from 20L. to 50L. a year, if they are boarders, at the rate of from 5L. to 15L. a year if they are day-scholars, an education of as good quality, with as good guarantees, social character, and advantages for a future career in the world, as the education which French children of the corresponding class can obtain from institutions like that of Toulouse or Sorèze?[82]

Moreover, Arnold was impressed by the fact that private secondary schools like Sorèze were in the minority, for private schools found it very hard to compete successfully with the abundant number of public institutions throughout France which offered respectable guarantees and reasonable charges. It was a complete State system which he was above all advocating for England, a system like that in a number of Continental nations.[83]

The last two thirds of A French Eton (1864) was an indictment of England's secondary educational provision and a call for a truly public system. While he had praise for the small number of great Public Schools, the newer schools such as Cheltenham, Bradfield, and Marlborough, and the Woodard institutions, his general attitude to England's middle class educational provision was contemptuous. It was in this provision that

> England is weak, and France, Holland and Germany are strong. Education is and must be a matter of public establishment. Other countries have replaced the defective public establishment made by the middle ages for their education with a new one, which provides for the actual condition of things. We in England keep our old public establishment for education. That is very well; but then we must not

> forget to supplement it where it falls short. We must not neglect to provide for the actual condition of things .... All, I say is, that it is most urgent to give to the establishment of it [secondary education] a wider, a truly public character, and that only the State can give this.[84]

iii) Arnold's SCHOOLS AND UNIVERSITIES ON THE CONTINENT

On March 9, 1865 Arnold was appointed as an Assistant Commissioner to the Taunton Commission which was charged with examining secondary education in England other than that provided by the great Public Schools which had already been studied by the Clarendon Commission (1861-64). His specific duty was to investigate middle and upper class education in France, Italy, Germany, and Switzerland, and in the discharge of this task he spent almost seven months on the Continent in 1865.[85] The Commission's Report was presented to the Government on December 2, 1867 and as with his findings for the earlier Newcastle Commission Arnold brought out his contribution to Taunton in book form. This was published on March 14, 1868 with the title Schools and Universities on the Continent. It was a lengthy work--it numbers over 300 pages in Super's 1964 edition--with much of the account devoted to the historical development of secondary and university education in the particular European countries under review. However, the larger part of the study was concerned with the contemporary condition of the foreign educational systems, systems which Arnold studied at first hand. Again, little attention will be paid here to most of the manifold interesting specific details discussed by Arnold in this report. Rather, mention will be made of a few of his most important conclusions stemming from his seven month sojourn abroad, particularly those where he drew lessons which he felt were beneficial for England's educational system. At any rate, he considered it important, as he wrote in the Preface, that the English middle class attend to foreign education; before concluding that they can learn nothing from it they should at least know and judge it. English education was worth studying for itself but also in comparison with its Continental counterpart.[86]

In his section on France Arnold had a mixture of praise and criticism for State involvement in that country's secondary and superior instruction. He welcomed the fact that France, unlike England, had an Education Minister and a Council of Public Instruction, that it was essential that teachers in both public and private schools be certificated, and that both types of school be open for State-inspection, the former to complete inspection, the latter to partial.[87] France differed from England in that the State maintained a much greater check over whom kept a private school; it did not allow, as in England, a totally ignorant and inexperienced individual or one who had undergone a criminal conviction to open such a school.[88] Anyway, because of the State schools, private education in France was a much less important matter than in England. At the time of writing his report France with a population of 37,500,000 had 74 lycées with 32,794 pupils, and 247 communal colleges with 33,038 pupils, making 65,832 public school pupils in all.[89] However, when the nine Public Schools examined by Clarendon, and the chief endowed grammar schools and the chief modern schools, such as Cheltenham and Marlborough, listed in the Public Schools Calendar were taken into account (even though Arnold remarked that many of the endowed schools were not up to the standard of a French communal college) the number of Public School boys in England with its population of about 20,000,000 was less than 16,000--"I think the English reader will be startled, as I was, by this comparison. If a public school education is an advantage, then this advantage is enjoyed by 50,000 more boys in France than with us."[90] Indeed, the seven great State classical *lycées* of Paris alone had almost twice as many pupils as the nine English Public Schools.[91]

When Arnold considered French superior education he also had praise for its State provision with its ennobling and civilising influences. The relative lack of such public superior institutions in England had had an adverse effect on the population there. Nevertheless, Arnold saw problems in what he viewed as excessive State involvement in French secondary and superior instruction: State interference was not necessarily a great benefit if it were extreme:

> In France, in her superior and still more in her secondary instruction, there is undoubtedly too much regulation by the central government, too much prescribing to teachers the precise course they shall follow, too much requiring of authorisations before a man may stir. If the professors were left free to arrange their programmes by concert among themselves, if any one, not ἄτιμος, and with proper guarantees of capacity (for to a rigorous demand for these there ought to be no objection) were free to open a school or to deliver public lectures without any further check whatever, thought and learning in France would in my opinion be great gainers. This change, however, would but remove what is an excrescence upon the public establishment of education, a noxious excrescence due to political causes, and to their predominance in France as with us (only with us they have operated in another way by preventing the public establishment of education altogether) over intellectual interests. All the salutary and civilising effects of the public establishment of education are to be had without this excrescence. When I come to Germany I will show them so

existing.[92]

Arnold confined most of his remarks about German education to the situation prevailing in Prussia. Though acknowledging that variations existed in the schools of different parts of Germany he stated that in its main features the school system was much the same throughout the different regions.[93] At any rate, he was much impressed with the State system of higher (or secondary) schools and the universities of Prussia. In 1863 Prussia, with a population of about 1,500,000 less than England, had 255 public secondary schools with 3,349 teachers and 66,135 pupils; this compared exceedingly well with the 15,880 pupils in the various establishments which might have been afforded the title Public School in England. In addition, it seemed as if the term public were more justly enjoyed by the Prussian institutions. For all of the Prussian schools, declared Arnold, possessed a public character, were subject to State inspection, had to have their accounts audited by a public functionary, and could only employ teachers whose qualifications had been strictly and publicly tried.[94] Furthermore, Prussian universities were State establishments and were maintained by the State so far as their own resources were inadequate; this was the case for the rest of Germany as well. Moreover, more students attended university in Germany than in England--the proportion of matriculated students in the former country was about 1:2,600 of the population, that in the latter was about 1:5,800.[95]

Arnold provided much information about diverse aspects of these State educational institutions in Prussia and the rest of Germany in his report, and he was generally very laudatory in his remarks--"Their schools are excellent," he wrote to his mother from Berlin while engaged on the Taunton Commission.[96] However, his most lavish praise centred on what was for him their greatest attribute, the very fact that they were State institutions. State involvement in Germany was the great difference between the educational system of that country and that of England. It was also a State involvement which he deemed to be much more satisfactory than that existing in France because of the absence of the pervasive political influences which had adversely affected the educational system of the latter nation. For even individuals opposed to the present government in Prussia informed Arnold

> that the State administration of the schools and universities was in practice fair and right; that public opinion would not suffer it to be governed by political regards, or by any but literary and scientific regards; and that public opinion would always, in this particular, find strong sympathies among the ministers themselves.[97]

Arnold concluded:

> The truth is, that when a nation has got the belief in culture which the Prussian nation has got, and when its schools are worthy of this belief, it will not suffer them to be sacrificed to any other interest; and however greatly political considerations may be paramount in other departments of administration, in this they are not. In France neither the national belief in culture nor the schools themselves are sufficiently developed to awaken this enthusiasm; and politics are too strong for the schools, and give them their own bias.[98]

Arnold also visited schools in Switzerland for the Taunton Commission, though he asserted that in most important respects Swiss secondary schools closely resembled their counterparts in Germany.[99] Thus, the

Swiss system was also a State one and was praised by Arnold on that account. Private schools did indeed exist but they were all open to State inspection and were required to provide annual reports concerning themselves to the authorities. In addition, the consent of the State had to be acquired for the opening of any private school and it was mandatory that the work-plan be officially approved. However, with the great development of State schools private schools were counting for less and less in the eyes of the Swiss themselves. Furthermore, teachers preferred the status and opportunities available in public schools. Indeed, the main reason for the existence of private schools in Switzerland, considered Arnold, was "POUR EXPLOITER LES ANGLAIS," many of whom sent their children to be educated in that country. [100] At any rate, the Swiss and English educational systems were very different and Arnold clearly favoured the former.

When he turned to the educational organisation of Italy Arnold, though pinpointing many problems and faults, displayed his pleasure at the extent of State-action. Indeed, when he was studying the Italian system at the time of the Taunton Commission the State was becoming increasingly involved in education, this being chiefly due to the LEGGE CASATI, the education law of November 13, 1859. However, Arnold perceived a distinct laxity in the workings of this law and considered that the public secondary schools displayed manifest weaknesses in a number of areas.[101] Still, despite their problems he regarded the State secondary schools as superior to the private ones and while the former had been experiencing some improvement and progress since 1859 the laxity of the latter had generally remained untouched.[102] At the time Arnold was writing this report extensive reforms had been proposed for all of Italy's educational system but they had not yet been carried into effect. Arnold agreed that sweeping reforms were welcome for he felt that "education in Italy needs to be reconstructed from the very bottom."[103] He considered that the Italian system compared very unfavourably with that in France on which it was closely modelled. Above all, he thought Italian teachers generally to be of little worth.[104] In a letter to his wife from Naples in May 1865 he wrote that the Italian "professors are very inferior to those in France, and generally, I must say, the impression of plain dealing, honesty, and efficiency, according to their own system, which one gets in France, is very different from what one gets here."[105] A little later he wrote to his sister K (Jane Martha): "I am tempted to take the professors I see in the schools by the collar, and hold them down to their work for five or six hours a day--so angry do I get at their shirking and inefficiency."[106] Still, for all the inefficiencies of the present system Arnold considered that Italy was following the modern Zeitgeist in turning more and more to increased State involvement in education: "But there is no doubt that the current which is bearing the Italians away from clerical schools, and carrying them towards public and lay schools, is the main current of modern civilisation."[107]

Arnold's main emphasis in his report for the Taunton Commission, as in the majority of his other educational works and of his social and political writings, was on the merits of increased State involvement. It was the dominant leitmotiv. Certainly, as we saw in his discussion on France, he was totally against excessive interference in a nation's affairs by the State; nevertheless, at the same time he was adamant that the State in England was far too little involved. He acknowledged that few other Englishmen had had the same opportunities as he to investigate at close quarters the civil organisation of foreign nations; but anyone else with his experiences would have to agree with his conclusion, that England's civil organisation was not fit to meet the requirements of a modern society and in this respect was falling behind that of France, Germany, Italy, Switzerland, and Holland.[108]

Judging from what he had witnessed on the Continent he was certain that any real system of public education in England must rest on a thorough system of municipal government. Elementary schools in France, Germany, Italy, Switzerland had as their foundation the municipal organisation of the commune, without which they could not exist. However, in England such an organisation did not yet exist and the country districts were still medieval in their feudal and ecclesiastical aspect or similar to ante-Revolutionary France. A modern municipal organisation was a sine qua non of an effective system of elementary education.[109] On the question of secondary education, Arnold continued, while many English considered it right that it be outside the jurisdiction of the State, opinion in a number of European nations was now different. In Prussia serious involvement in secondary education by the State began under the aegis of Wilhelm Von Humboldt in 1809, the year in which he founded the University of Berlin. Similarly, in Switzerland the State had over the last thirty years taken in hand all kinds of education, while in Italy the State's involvement dated from 1859. In these three nations it was considered that a good modern civil organisation must have a State or public system of secondary and higher instruction.[110] In England, however, such instruction was completely private and on the whole it was not so good nor was it imparted in so good institutions as those on the Continent. Generally, it was only the English upper classes who benefited from good schools while the middle classes suffered indifferent schooling. On the Continent, however, the upper and middle classes were usually educated together and may be said to be educated on the first plane. In England the middle classes were educated on the second plane and as a result suffered social and intellectual inconveniences, inconveniences which greatly retarded England's progress in the modern world.[111] But Arnold was clear that these social and intellectual inconveniences were to be remedied through the agency of secondary and superior instruction respectively. Generally, he saw education as the panacea for England's problems, and in the second part of the concluding chapter of Schools and Universities on the Continent (1868) he provided a brief sketch drawing on his comparative educational studies abroad of the educational organisation which he proposed would eliminate these problems. A detailed discussion of Arnold's plan for improving England's educational system at the secondary and higher level, and through it the civilisation of what he considered to be the Philistine middle class, is contained in Chapter Six of this present work. At the moment it is worthwhile to quote the last paragraph of Schools and Universities on the Continent (1868) which is, in effect, in encapsulated form Arnold's chief thesis formed from his comparative educational work on the Continent:

> Seven years ago, having being sent by a Royal Commission to study the primary schools on the Continent, I was so much struck by all I then saw, and by the comparison of it with what I had left

> behind me in England, that looking beyond the immediate scope of my errand, I said to my countrymen on my return: ORGANISE YOUR SECONDARY INSTRUCTION. That advice passed perfectly unheeded, the hubbub of our sterile politics continued, ideas of social reconstruction had not a thought given them, our secondary instruction is still the chaos it was; and yet now, so urgent and irresistible is the impression left upon me by what I have again seen abroad, I cannot help presenting myself once more to my countrymen with an increased demand: ORGANISE YOUR SECONDARY AND YOUR SUPERIOR INSTRUCTION. [112]

iv) Arnold's SPECIAL REPORT ON CERTAIN POINTS CONNECTED WITH ELEMENTARY EDUCATION IN GERMANY, SWITZERLAND, AND FRANCE

In late 1885 Arnold received instructions from the Education Department to travel to Germany, Switzerland, and France in order to investigate various aspects of elementary education with special emphasis being placed on the first two countries. The aspects to be examined were: free education; quality of education; status, training, and pensioning of teachers; compulsory attendance and release from school. Arnold departed from England on November 1, 1885 and travelled to Northern Germany where he remained until his return to England for the Christmas season. He proceeded once again to the Continent on January 21, 1886, this time spending two months visiting French, Swiss, and Bavarian schools with a few days of further examination of North German schools on his way home. Accordingly, as he informed us on the first page of his report, entitled Special Report on Certain Points Connected with Elementary Education in Germany, Switzerland, and France, issued by the Stationary Office in July 1886 for the Education Department, he spent in all about fourteen weeks undertaking his mission, with five weeks in Prussia, two in Saxony, two in Bavaria, two in Switzerland, and three in France.[113] This was a busy period for Arnold for on April 6 and 7 of that year he was summoned to give evidence before the Cross Commission which was charged with examining the Elementary Education Acts of England and Wales. The Commissioners were specifically interested in the results of Arnold's recent investigation into aspects of Continental education.

Once again it is unnecessary for our purposes to enquire closely into the precise details given by Arnold in his report respecting the various points of foreign education. What is more important is to indicate how his investigations abroad affected his attitudes towards English education. Were the conclusions reached from this comparative educational study only a couple of years before his death in general conformity with those reached on his previous official sojourns abroad, for the Newcastle and Taunton Commissions, twenty-six and twenty years earlier respectively? The immediate answer is that Arnold even as late as 1886 felt that English education was lagging behind that of certain nations on the Continent and that England could still learn much from these nations in various educational matters. On the question of popular education Arnold declared that it was dangerous for the English to imagine that they had no reason to be envious of schools abroad and that they could learn nothing from them. Rather, what the English were proud of in their schools was nothing other than "machinery" (a favourite word of Arnold) and what they should remember was "that foreign schools with larger classes, longer holidays, and a school-day often cut in two..., nevertheless, on the whole, give, from the better training of their teachers, and the better planning of their school course, a superior popular instruction to ours."[114] Thus, England had still lessons to learn from abroad. In addition, it is quite significant that the conclusion of this 1886 report for the Education Department was a reiteration of the advice fervently proffered in Arnold's two earlier reports for the 1859 and 1865 Commissions. Once again, he stressed the

> need to ORGANISE OUR SECONDARY INSTRUCTION. This is desirable in the interest of our secondary and higher instruction, of course, principally; but it is desirable, I may say it is indispensable, in the interest of our popular instruction also. Every one now admits that popular instruction is a matter for public institution and supervision; but so long as public institution and supervision stop there, and no contact and correlation are established between our popular instruction and the instruction above it, so long the condition of our popular instruction itself will and must be unsatisfactory.[115]

Of course Arnold did not confine his comparative educational opinions on the merits and demerits of foreign schools and their organisation vis-à-vis those of England's schools and their organisation to his three official reports and to A French Eton. In his prolific prose oeuvre there were many other essays, articles, lectures, and letters in which mention was made, sometimes at length, of these topics. Again and again in his works Arnold returned to the question of the inadequacies of English education and the need to improve it if the nation's future was to be one of modernity and progress, and very often he juxtaposed his plaints regarding English society and schools with praise of Continental conditions. Occasion will be found in subsequent chapters to consider many of these references and also to return to the various works discussed above. We turn now, however, to what was one of the main intellectual influences on Arnold stemming, as we have seen, from his actual experiences abroad as well as from his copious readings in foreign literatures and thought, namely his theory of the State and its role in a modern society.

REFERENCES

1. Letter to his sister K (Jane Martha), 1853, Whitridge, *Unpublished Letters*, p. 22.
2. Letter to his wife, Wednesday (1854), Russell, *Letters* 1:39.
3. Letter to his sister Fan, January 18, 1859, Ibid., 1:77.
4. Letter to his sister K (Jane Martha), February 16, 1859, Ibid., 1:78-79.
5. Letter to his mother, March 11, 1865, Ibid., 1:251.
6. Letter to his son Dick, October 19, 1885, Ibid., 2:286.
7. Letter to his mother, February 4, 1869, Ibid., 2:2.
8. Letter to his mother, Sunday, August 18, 1871, Ibid., 2:62.
9. "On the Modern Element in Literature," *Prose Works* 1:21.
10. Preface to the Second Edition of *Higher Schools and Universities in Germany*, *Prose Works* 7:92.
11. "Disestablishment in Wales," *Prose Works* 11:336.
12. "Equality," *Prose Works* 8:293.
13. Preface to *Schools and Universities on the Continent*, *Prose Works* 4:23.
14. Of course, Arnold's experiences of foreign education could not but have had some influence upon his thoughts of domestic education. As he wrote in his 1867 General Report for Elementary Schools after his work abroad for the Taunton Commission: "It was natural, too, that in returning to the inspection of primary schools in England, I should have in mind both my former return to them after a similar visit to the Continent, and the experience which each of my visits to the Continent had afforded me." (*Reports on Elementary Schools*, ed. Sandford, p. 110).
15. *A French Eton*, *Prose Works* 2:279.
16. *Schools and Universities on the Continent*, *Prose Works* 4:289, 313-314, 328.
17. Preface to the Second Edition of *Higher Schools and Universities in Germany*, *Prose Works* 7:90.
18. Preface to *Schools and Universities on the Continent*, *Prose Works* 4:20; see also p. 25.
19. *Schools and Universities on the Continent*, *Prose Works* 4:312.

20. "The Function of Criticism at the Present Time," Prose Works 3:282.

21. Preface (1869) to Culture and Anarchy, Prose Works 5:233; Preface to the First Edition (1873) of Literature and Dogma, Prose Works 6:151.

22. Willey, Nineteenth Century Studies, p. 251; W. Anderson, "Matthew Arnold and the Grounds of Comparatism," Comparative Literature Studies 8, No. 4 (Dec. 1971):297. J.W. Frierson observes that in certain literary aspects Arnold resembles Voltaire and that this is especially evident in their Pan-Europeanism, a quality which makes both men reminiscent of Erasmus and More. [J.W. Frierson, "Matthew Arnold, philosophe," Studies on Voltaire and the Eighteenth Century 25 (1963):656]. F.W. Knickerbocker also states that Arnold, together with John Morley and Lord Acton, expressed the European mind. [F.W. Knickerbocker, Free Minds: John Morley and his Friends, first published 1943 (Conn., U.S.A.: Greenwood Press, Publishers, 1970), p. 164]. In like manner, Basil A. Smith asks "if Dr. Arnold was a man of European outlook how much more so must his enlightened son have been, nurtured upon George Sand and Goethe and all that those two beacons of the wider culture had led him to?" However, Smith goes on to argue that Arnold's "cosmopolitanism was more apparent than fundamental" and that "it disguised a special form of patriotic anxiety." [Basil A. Smith, "Matthew Arnold: 'The Dandy Isaiah,'" Modern Age 1, No. 2 (Fall 1957):190-191]. Park Honan in an interesting article, "Fox How and the Continent: Matthew Arnold's Path to the European Sentimental School and 'La Passion Réfléchissante,'" shows that the intellectual environment Matthew experienced while young at the Arnold's home at Fox How near Ambleside was very instrumental in putting him in touch with the Continent. [Park Honan, "Fox How and the Continent: Matthew Arnold's path to the European Sentimental School and 'La Passion Réfléchissante,'" Victorian Poetry, 16, Nos. 1 and 2 (Spring/Summer, 1978):58-69].

23. Letter to his sister K (Jane Martha), Wednesday (May 1848), Russell, Letters 1:9.

24. "The Function of Criticism at the Present Time," Prose Works 3:284. Referring to the same passage Kenneth Allott declares that "Arnold is a European." (Allott, Matthew Arnold, p. 31).

25. "Wordsworth," Prose Works 9:38.

26. On the Study of Celtic Literature, Prose Works 3:376.

27. "My Countrymen," Prose Works 5:13.

28. "Theodore Parker," Prose Works 5:81.

29. Preface to Last Essays, Prose Works 8:151.

30. "Roman Catholics and the State," Prose Works 7:135.

31. "Joseph de Maistre on Russia," Prose Works 9:87.

32. "A Genevese Judge," Prose Works 9:291. Lord Edward Bulwer Lytton was attributed with the possession of a European tone. In a letter to Lytton of February 24, 1869 Arnold wrote: "Your sympathy and approbation give me great pleasure; the more so because I am conscious, as I think I have told you before, of a very considerable debt of gratitude to a certain European tone of reflection and sentiment in your writings, which impressed me and suited me from the first times when I began to read at all, and before I found anything else of the same kind anywhere else." [The A.K. Davis-Matthew Arnold Collection, Univ. of Virginia Library, No. 4885, Box 17 (Ms. Kirsch's transcript)].

33. "Johnson's Lives of the Poets," Prose Works 8:312.

34. Letter to M. Fontanès, Easter Sunday,1879, Russell, Letters 2:158.

35. Letter to Arthur Hugh Clough, August 2,1855, Lowry, Letters to Clough, p. 147.

36. Letter to his mother, February 20, 1869, Russell, Letters 2:4.

37. "Up to Easter," Prose Works 11:200.

38. The Popular Education of France, Prose Works 2:32.

39. Introd. to The Popular Education of France, Prose Works 2:16.

40. "A Speech at Westminster," Prose Works 7:83-84.

41. Ibid., p. 84.

42. "German and English Universities," Prose Works 4:329.

43. Schools and Universities on the Continent, Prose Works 4:281. It is true that before actually going abroad for the Taunton Commission Arnold had expectations of garnering as much information as possible about girls' schools. In a letter to Sarah Emily Davies of February 27, 1865 he wrote: "If, as I hope, the Commission sends me abroad, I shall pick up all I can about the education of girls in the middle and upper ranks of foreign society, as well as that of boys." [The A.K. Davis-Matthew Arnold Collection, Univ. of Virginia Library, No. 4885, Box 15 (Ms. Kirsch's transcript)].

44. A French Eton, Prose Works 2:265.

45. Preface to the Second Edition of Schools and Universities in Germany, Prose Works 7:93.

46. Preface to Schools and Universities on the Continent, Prose Works 4:21.

47. Ibid., p. 20.

48. Ibid., p. 23.

49. The Popular Education of France, Prose Works 2:114.

50. Special Report (1886), Prose Works 11:20. It is interesting that when engaged as an Assistant Commissioner for the Taunton Commission in France in 1865 Arnold had difficulty in obtaining leave to be present at lessons in the secondary schools, however he persisted and was eventually granted permission. (Letter to his wife, April 27, 1865, Russell, Letters 1:257-258).

51. The Popular Education of France, Prose Works 2:129.

52. Preface to Schools and Universities on the Continent, Prose Works 4:16.

53. Ibid., p. 19.

54. Ibid., p. 20.

55. "A Speech at Westminster," Prose Works 7:81-82.

56. Sir Thomas Fitch, Thomas and Matthew Arnold and Their Influence on English Education, New York, 1899, p. 37, quoted in Bachem, "Pioneers," p. 599.

57. F.J.W. Harding, Matthew Arnold: The Critic and France, (Geneva: Libraire Droz, 1964), p. 178. In addition, it is well to remember that Arnold's educational writings were based on sound and extensive practical experience. Raymond Williams is correct to warn against treating Arnold as an ivory tower don who uttered his pronouncements paying little heed to the harsh realities and practicalities of everyday life. On the contrary, Arnold's practical involvement in educational matters "was intense and sustained," displaying "nothing of the dandy" in his battle against the Revised Code. To counteract the accusations of vagueness in his theoretical writings, readers are advised by Williams to consult the detailed analyses found in his "reports, minutes, evidence to commissions, and specifically educational essays which made up so large a part of Arnold's working life." (Williams, Culture and Society, p. 128). In like manner, Douglas Bush considers that to regard Arnold as a don-like figure far removed from actual day-to-day concerns of Victorian England is "a travesty." Rather, he was one "who knew far more about the condition of England than most of his critics, a man who for nearly twenty years had been going up and down the country inspecting Nonconformist schools and absorbing firsthand knowledge of the middle and lower classes." (Bush, Matthew Arnold, p. 147).

58. McCarthy, Matthew Arnold, p. 87.

59. The Popular Education of France, Prose Works 2:142.

60. Ibid., p. 142.

61. Ibid., p. 143.

62. Ibid., p. 143.

63. Ibid., p. 144.

64. Ibid., p. 145.

65. Ibid., p. 148.

66. Ibid., p. 112; also p. 132.

67. Ibid., p. 155.

68. Ibid., pp. 158-159.

69. See Walcott, Origins of Culture and Anarchy, pp. 120-121.

70. The Popular Education of France, Prose Works 2:164-165.

71. Ibid., p. 168.

72. Ibid., p. 179.

73. Ibid., p. 208.

74. Ibid., p. 209.

75. Ibid., p. 87; also p. 53.

76. Ibid., p. 22.; also pp. 53-54.

77. A French Eton, Prose Works 2:264-265.

78. Ibid., pp. 266-267.

79. Ibid., pp. 275-276.

80. Schools and Universities on the Continent, Prose Works 4:60.

81. The Popular Education of France, Prose Works 2:105.

82. A French Eton, Prose Works 2:279.

83. Ibid., p. 294.

84. Ibid., p. 295.

85. Preface to Schools and Universities on the Continent, Prose Works 4:15.

86. Ibid., pp.27-28.

87. Schools and Universities on the Continent, Prose Works 4:60, 18.

88. Ibid., p. 97.

89. Ibid., p. 58; p. 306. As we have seen, at the time of the Newcastle Commission Report there were over 63 lycées and 244 communal colleges in France.

90. Ibid., pp. 105-106.

91. Ibid., p. 87.

92. Ibid., p. 138.

93. Ibid., p. 187.

94. Ibid., p. 195.

95. Ibid., p. 255.

96. Letter to his mother, July 5, 1865, Russell, Letters 1:288.

97. Schools and Universities on the Continent, Prose Works 4:229.

98. Ibid., pp. 229-230.

99. Ibid., p. 267.

100. Ibid., pp. 283-284.

101. Ibid., pp. 150-161.

102. Ibid., p. 167.

103. Ibid., p. 180.

104. Ibid., p. 181.

105. Letter to his wife, May 1865, Russell, Letters 1:273.

106. Letter to his sister K (Jane Martha), June 21, 1865, Ibid., 1:280.

107. Schools and Universities on the Continent, Prose Works 4:182.

108. Ibid., p. 304.

109. Ibid., p. 306.

110. Ibid., p. 307.

111. Ibid., p. 308.

112. Ibid., p. 328.

113. Special Report (1886), Prose Works 11:1.

114. Ibid., p. 53. In the course of a lecture "Common Schools Abroad" delivered at the University of Pennsylvania on June 8, a month before the Special Report was officially issued, Arnold also compared foreign education with that of England and once again his country came off distinctly second best. For example, with respect to matters of teaching Arnold declared that when he was recently abroad on the Continent "I had, of course, our English popular schools constantly in my mind while I was observing the foreign schools, and the comparison thus established was highly instructive. In general I thought the methods of teaching better in the foreign schools than with us, and the results of the teaching better. And they are better because the teachers are better trained." ("Common Schools Abroad," Prose Works 11:96-97).

115. Special Report (1886), Prose Works 11:53.

CHAPTER THREE

ARNOLD AND THE ROLE OF THE STATE IN MODERN SOCIETY

A) Arnold's View of the State

i) Arnold: Political Philosopher or Practical Politician?

Before considering Arnold's views on the role of the State in society it should be stressed that it is a mistake to expect from him a very highly developed theoretical exposition. Though he had firm views on this topic they were not the views of a philosopher. Indeed, he admitted in a number of writings that expertise in philosophical speculation was not his forte.[1] In his February, 1866 article in the Cornhill, "My Countrymen," he wrote that he did "not quite know what to say about the transcendental system of philosophy, for I am a mere dabbler in these great matters, and to grasp and hold a system of philosophy is a feat much beyond my strength."[2] He accepted in Culture and Anarchy (1869) Frederic Harrison's jibe, published in his 1867 "Culture: a Dialogue," which accused him of lacking "a philosophy with coherent, interdependent, subordinate, and derivative principles."[3] In the same work he confessed to an "inexpertness in reasoning and arguing," calling himself "a plain, unsystematic writer." Moreover, he declared: "From a man without a philosophy no one can expect philosophical completeness," and "we, who, having no coherent philosophy, must not let ourselves philosophise."[4] Even years later, in his 1885 article "A Word More about America," he acknowledged his weakness in philosophical reasoning declaring that de Tocqueville's Démocratie en Amérique "deals too much in abstractions for my taste .... My debility in high speculation is well known, and I mean to attempt his book on Democracy again when I have seen America once more, and when years may have brought to me perhaps, more of the philosophic mind,"--the last phrase echoes Wordsworth's "Ode: Intimations of Immortality from Recollections of Early Childhood."[5] Yet, it should be borne in mind that Arnold's protestations of philosophic debility are perhaps a little disingenuous. Indeed, it seems as if he is using a rhetorical device common with him. He admits his weakness and then keeps re-iterating it until it eventually loses its force. Nevertheless, it is true that he did not limit his treatment of the State to an abstract philosophical analysis. Nor indeed, was his treatment the more concrete one of the practising politician. In fact, he was usually at pains to distance himself, with respect to his general political, social, and educational views, from any identification with practical politics, "that Thyestean banquet of claptrap."[6] Though he frequently immersed himself in the burning political questions of the day, his involvement was confined to the article, the essay, the letter to the newspaper or journal, the lecture-hall. He would persuade the British public of the proper political course by literary means rather than the more practical means of the professional politician. As he declared in "Irish Catholicism and British Liberalism" (1878): "I do not profess to be a politician, but simply one of a disinterested class of observers, who, with no organised and embodied set of supporters to please, set themselves to observe honestly and to report faithfully the state and prospects of our civilisation."[7] To the Ipswich Working Men's College on January 8, 1879 he asserted quite categorically that he was not a politician, that he had no interest in their borough, in any other borough, or indeed in any parliamentary honours.[8] He was quite content to be "a man of letters" rather than one of the "Practical politicians and men of the world," and in attempting to bring to fruition his educational designs he could state, "things in England being what they are, I am glad to work indirectly by literature rather than directly by politics."[9] In a letter to James Bryce of the following year he referred to himself as "the most unpolitical man alive."[10]

His treatment of the State was not that of the speculative philosopher who stood apart from contemporary affairs, nor that of the politician who cared much more for practical effect than the theoretical bases for his actions. Rather, his view of the State was that of the well-read individual, who had a fervent interest in all the diverse affairs of modern England. Undoubtedly, this view owed something to his readings in ancient and modern authors, in this regard the writings of Thucydides, Plato, Aristotle being most prominent among the former and those of Burke, Michelet, Mignet, Montesquieu, de Tocqueville, Renan, Guizot, Cousin, Von Humboldt among the latter. In addition, his views on the nature of history and of progress, in which he was strongly influenced by Vico and Niebuhr, obviously had a symbiotic relationship with those on the State. But it is perhaps impossible to isolate any one particular writer and declare categorically that Arnold was primarily indebted to him for the formulation of his notion of the State and State-action--Burke, maybe, comes closest. But it may be argued that though his views on these topics were of course moulded to a certain extent by his prolific readings, the greatest source for these views was his own first-hand experiences of the State in action abroad gained from his unofficial and, especially, his official tours of Continental nations. As Park Honan has observed, besides Arnold's eclectic reading what he "HAD SEEN in France helped him to form his doctrine that the State must be made to embody the nation's collective 'best self' and give a humane character to society."[11] Seeing with his own eyes the benefits accruing from the extensive State system in force in certain foreign countries placed before him in sharp contrast the situation in his own England where any proposals to extend State power to any appreciable degree were invariably met with strong negative reaction. Furthermore, it can be maintained that it was his on-the-spot experiences of State or public education in these foreign countries which particularly impressed Arnold and which went to mould, above all other sources, his plans to extend greatly State-action in his own country, especially in the realm of education.

ii) What exactly did Arnold Understand by the State?

Arnold was not unaware of the difficulty entailed in understanding his notion of the State. He readily admitted this difficulty in his Introduction to The Popular Education of France (1861), declaring that to comprehend this notion fully required deep research in the world of ideas. Still, he considered it possible to provide a practical definition of it in unambiguous language: "The State is properly just what Burke called it--'the nation in its collective and corporate character'. The State is the representative acting-power of the nation; the action of the State is the representative action of the nation."[12] Similarly, in Culture and Anarchy (1869) he spoke of "the notion, so familiar on the Continent and to antiquity, of THE

STATE--the nation in its collective and corporate character, entrusted with stringent powers for the general advantage, and controlling individual wills in the name of an interest wider than that of individuals."[13] Moreover, this collective nature, rising above individuals and classes and connoting the whole community must have as its basis and also reflect our "best self":

> We want an authority, and we find nothing but jealous classes, checks, and a dead-lock; culture suggests the idea of THE STATE. We find no basis for a firm State-power in our ordinary selves; culture suggests one to us in our BEST SELF.[14]

As he declared in the Introduction to *The Popular Education of France* (1861):

> ...the State-power which it employs should be a power which really represents its best self, and whose action its intelligence and justice can heartily avow and adopt; not a power which reflects its inferior self, and of whose action, as of its own second-rate action, it has perpetually to be ashamed. To offer a worthy initiative, and to set a standard of rational and equitable action,--this is what the nation should expect of the State; and the more the State fulfils this expectation, the more will it be accepted in practice for what in idea it must always be.[15]

Furthermore, Arnold was especially insistent in *Culture and Anarchy* (1869), because of the epoch of social disintegration and tumultuous change through which England was passing, that it was now essential to establish this State, that "organ of our collective best self, of our national right reason." [We are clearly reminded of the distinction Rousseau made between the higher VOLONTÉ GÉNÉRALE and the ordinary VOLONTÉ DE TOUS, a distinction quite foreign to the tradition of English political philosophy]. Such a State, being above the separate classes, would maintain the needed order in society and deal stringently with any excesses of the three classes as presently constituted.[16] There was too much stress on the benefits of individual action in England, representing the mere "ordinary self," with too little on those of that action which reflects the collective "best self" of the nation. Indeed, being the expression of our "best self" the State would be a particularly strong bulwark against the threatening anarchy about which Arnold was so apprehensive in Culture and Anarchy (1869):

> ...as, believing in right reason, and having faith in the progress of humanity towards perfection, and even labouring for this end, we grow to have clearer sight of the ideas of right reason, and of the elements and helps of perfection, and come gradually to fill the framework of the State with them, to fashion its internal composition and all its laws and institutions conformably to them, and to make the State more and more the expression, as we say, of our best self, which is not manifold, and vulgar, and unstable, and contentious, and ever-varying, but one, and noble, and secure, and peaceful, and the same for all mankind,--with what aversion shall we not THEN regard anarchy, with what firmness shall we not check it, when there is so much that is so precious which it will endanger![17]

Arnold though never imagining that State-action in France was the best possible and was incapable of improvement, nevertheless considered that it was far better and more beneficial to society at large than what existed in England. In particular, he was convinced that in France the better reason of the collective action of the community was much better expressed and represented. As he argued in The Popular Education of France (1861) both countries had quite different notions of what exactly the State is. Certainly the English people marked by a strongly independent spirit had generally agreed that there should be as little State interference as possible. But while great benefits had undoubtedly accrued to the English national character by this standing apart from State-action there had also resulted the problem that there was a lack of intelligence and power higher than those of ordinary individuals. It was such intelligence and power which the State represented. In particular, the English State had rarely acted "as if it was THE ORGAN OF THE NATIONAL REASON," and consequently its actions were in this respect "in very remarkable contrast with those of the State in France."[18] Thinking in particular of the educational sphere, Arnold argued that the government of a nation sometimes has to deal with opinions which have little rational basis, but "are mere crotchets, or mere prejudices, or mere passions." The government, accordingly, should treat such opinions as the irrationalities they in fact are; unintelligence and fanaticism must be dealt with as such. If they are not, then it follows that the national intelligence will suffer damage. He suggested that the State in England had on occasion made this mistake. The State in France had been quite different, and he agreed with Napoleon who maintained that though the French State had great powers the one force which the State (or he himself, as both State and Napoleon were well-nigh identical) could not run counter to was the "great force of rational and respectable sentiment in the mass of the French people." Furthermore, even in modern times, Arnold asserted, it was impossible for the French State to disregard such a force. On the contrary, the State

> must, in its acts, have its stand upon some ground of reason, and it can afford to treat cheaply only unreason. When a priest demands to rebaptise dissenters admitted to a public school, when a dissenter demands to be exempted from school-taxation because it hurts his conscience to help maintain schools in which may be taught a religion which he dislikes, such pretensions as

> these the French State treats as phantoms which it may confidently disdain--for they are IRRATIONAL.[19]

It was such a State which Arnold desired for England, by no means one, absolute and despotic, which could crush alike reason and unreason but a State which would strive to represent the collective action of the community in toto and express the better, more rational reason of all while disregarding all irrationalities.[20]

Arnold was invariably anxious to stress the cooperative nature of "the collective nation" [21] or State, a nature quite opposed to the pervasive individualistic and laissez-faire spirit prevalent in his day. In answer to a charge in the Pall Mall Gazette on December 20, 1865 that his concept of the State was fallacious Arnold had published in the same newspaper two days later a letter which asserted that the State was rather more than the persons who actually managed it. In his support he quoted lines by George Wither which he had found in Coleridge

> let not your King and Parliament in one,
> Much less apart, mistake themselves for that
> Which is most worthy to be thought upon,
> Nor think they are essentially the State.
> But let them know there is A DEEPER LIFE
> WHICH THEY BUT REPRESENT;
> THAT THERE'S ON EARTH A YET AUGUSTER THING,
> VEIL'D THOUGH IT BE, THAN PARLIAMENT AND KING.

For Arnold this "auguster thing" was the collective will of the community and it was this which the parliament or State must strive to represent. Also the State must seek to express the better or more rational reason of the collective action of the community, not the more mundane irrational things stemming from stupidity and passions which tended to emanate from the common run of the community taken as a whole. Above all, insisted Arnold, it must be understood that the State was more than the few members of the nobility, clergy, and gentry who made up the Parliament--it was the community at large.[22]

In a later work, "'Ecce, Convertimur ad Gentes,'" a lecture delivered on January 6, 1879, Arnold argued that using State-action signified using a superior kind of cooperation, and he strongly advocated such use when the object of the cooperation was a rational and useful one, for example, the provision of State or public schools in England. Furthermore, he insisted that to persevere in hostility to such State interference, which was in effect only cooperation, meant remaining in a "condition of certain inferiority"--he was here implying inferiority relative to the condition of certain Continental nations.[23] In the same work Arnold was also at pains to refute the notion held by some, and he took as their representative Professor Fawcett, that a belief in the State betrayed a belief in modern socialism. Socialism and State involvement, they maintained, were inextricably intertwined. In the face of this threat Fawcett, Arnold reported, urged the English working class to increased self-reliance and self-help and to be especially on their guard "against resort to the State, centralisation, bureaucracy, and the loss of individual liberty."[24] Arnold who disavowed any connection between his collectivisation and socialism had little time for Fawcett's argument and quoted as support the words of the French liberal leader M. Gambetta against the detractors of State-action: "'I am not for the abuses of centralisation, but these attacks on THE STATE, which is France, often make me impatient. I am a defender of THE STATE. I will not use the word centralisation; but I am a defender of the national CENTRALITY, which has made the French nation what it is now, and which is essential to our progress.'"[25] The English, Arnold felt, were not likely to suffer the State to take upon itself too much power; rather, their tendencies were quite opposite, for their main problem was an over-reliance on self, self-assertion, and individual liberty.[26] But Arnold consistently maintained his objections to this ideal of self-reliance, "Self-Help," and independence as far as possible from State control, repeatedly asseverating that the notion of liberty common among the English must be curtailed and a new understanding of it be introduced throughout society. Even a return to that understanding of the ancients would be welcome and in this regard, in his essay "Joubert," he quoted that individual on the changes which the word "liberty" had undergone:

> "A great many words have changed their meaning. The word LIBERTY, for example, had at bottom among the ancients the same meaning as the word DOMINION. I WOULD BE FREE meant, in the mouth of the ancient, I WOULD TAKE PART IN GOVERNING OR ADMINISTERING THE STATE; in the mouth of a modern it means, I WOULD BE INDEPENDENT. The word LIBERTY has with us a moral sense; with them its sense was purely political."[27]

In like manner, Arnold wished his fellow countrymen to embrace that liberty which would subordinate them to the power of the State, a liberty which would make them truly free as they themselves would be the State. Indeed, this was how he viewed the relation between citizens and State in France, a situation which was still far from being realised in his own country. As he wrote to his mother on July 27, 1866:

> Not that I do not think it, in itself, a bad thing that the principle of authority should be so weak here; but whereas in France, since the Revolution, a man feels that the power which represses him is

> the STATE, is HIMSELF, here a man feels that the power which represses him is the Tories, the upper class, the aristocracy, and so on; and with this feeling he can, of course, never without loss of self-respect accept a formal beating, and so the thing goes on smouldering. If ever there comes a more equal state of society in England, the power of the State for repression will be a thousand times stronger.[28]

Now Arnold, it must be admitted, as the years progressed became increasingly worried lest democracy, raw and pervasive, might turn into a medium for unbridled coercion. It could be that the last sentence in the passage just quoted constituted a vision of a future society ostensibly egalitarian, but tending towards extreme authoritarianism or totalitarianism. He was certainly enough of a political realist to be well aware that the initial ideals of the French Revolution had quickly deteriorated. However, I judge the sentence to mean no more than in a democratic society with true liberty being available to all, unlike the situation in Arnold's England, all the people, being themselves the State, would no longer be able to blame anyone but THEMSELVES, as the State, for any repression suffered. Such liberty would mean that it would no longer be the Tories or the governing party representing the wishes of only a small portion of the population who would be the agency of repression.

It is clear that to Arnold man's liberty is very important and if the State acts as a force undermining it rather than as an agency endeavouring to bring it to true fruition then this State cannot last. As he wrote in the Preface to Mixed Essays (1879), man's love of liberty is simply his instinct for expansion and is accordingly quite natural, and when this liberty is threatened too much by authority this authority is bound to fail. Obviously, Arnold did not want his State to be despotic or tyrannous. However, he was just as stern in his rejection of a benevolent rational absolutism of the Bismarck variety. For this type of State possesses a fatal flaw, namely that it is against nature contradicting as it does man's vital instinct for expansion. Moreover, being unnatural, in the long run this "benevolent rational absolutism always breaks down."[29] State-action to be successful must complement and enhance the individual's liberty, and help him to attain his fullest development and perfection, just as had happened, he observed in A French Eton (1864), in ancient Greece where "the individual was strong enough to fashion the State into an instrument of his own perfection, to make it serve, with a thousand times his own power, towards his own ends."[30]

The problem in England, according to Arnold, was that the average individual regarded himself and the State as two totally distinct, mutually incompatible entities, with his status relative to the State being necessarily one of dependency; the State's collective and corporate character was denied. But this notion of dependency Arnold took care to dismiss forcefully in A French Eton (1864) asserting that the relation was more "that of a member in a partnership to the whole firm"; citizens were really partners in the State.[31] Consequently, to consider that State-action, and Arnold was thinking in particular in this work of the provision of education by the State, was nothing other than charity and therefore degrading was totally wrong. Certainly, citizens benefited from the State but as they were members or collective partners in the State they were in reality benefiting from their own cooperative association. Thus it was without meaning to hold that it was humiliation for an individual to be helped by the State in the education of his children: it was hardly humiliation to receive "help for himself as an individual from himself in his corporate and associated capacity! help to which his own money, as a tax-payer, contributes, and for which, as a result of the joint energy and intelligence of the whole community in employing its powers, he himself deserves some of the praise!"[32] Arnold ironically pointed out that an Englishman did not consider it eleemosynary or pauperising to send his children to schools paid by Woodard's subscription, or to accept help for his children's education from the local squire, rector, ironmonger, druggist, but he only deemed it humiliating when such help emanated from the State, "when he helps to give it himself!"[33] Earlier, in his article "The Twice-Revised Code" published in the March 1862 issue of _Fraser Magazine_, Arnold had also employed a similar argument in his scornful denunciation of the cry to preserve the independence of schools. What is meant by this independence? he asked. Is a poor person maintaining greater independence by having the squire or rector help in paying for his children's education, rather than the State so doing? "Are his reasonable wishes as to the kind of that education more likely to be respected by his local, or by his imperial benefactor? To state a commonplace like this fully, is to refute it."[34] But what Arnold himself considered truly beneficial State-action was set forth in _A French Eton_ (1864):

> By really agreeing to deal in our collective and corporate character with education, we can form ourselves into the best and most efficient of voluntary societies by managing it. We can make State-action upon it a genuine local government of it, the faithful but potent expression of our own

> activity. We can make the central Government that mere court of disinterested review and correction, which every sensible man would always be glad to have for his own activity. We shall have all our self-reliance and individual action still (in this country we shall always be more likely to tyrannise over the whole than the whole over the parts), but we shall have had the good sense to turn them to account by a powerful, but still voluntary, organisation.[35]

Arnold attempted to bolster his plea for increased State-action in England by turning for support in Culture and Anarchy (1869) to the views of two Continental figures who had influenced his views on the State, the Prussian Wilhelm Von Humboldt and the Frenchman M. Renan. He was particularly interested in their views on the dichotomy between the ideal of individual freedom unfettered by the constraints of government and the restraint of a State power. Referring to The Sphere and Duties of Government by Von Humboldt, "one of the most beautiful souls that have ever existed" [36], Arnold declared that in this work Von Humboldt argued that the powers of a government should be confined to what is of most direct concern to the security of both person and property and that individual action and individual perfection must be striven for. However, Von Humboldt also realised that this would be an ideal situation and that for a very long time to come greater action by the State would be mandatory. Moreover, shortly after he wrote the above work Von Humboldt was appointed Prussia's Minister of Education and it was during his tenure that the Prussian State assumed wide control over education. Even though Arnold believed that in Von Humboldt's Germany there was in general too little individual action and too much stress on the Government, it is hardly surprising that he suggested that England, whose problems were the exact opposite, should for the present pay much more attention to Von Humboldt's actual endeavours in the sphere of State control and much less on his theoretical writings which argued for limitations being placed on the powers of the State. He also focused in Culture and Anarchy (1869) on State control over individuals in France which he considered to be even greater than in Germany. Nevertheless, he could turn to one of the firmest of these vociferous advocates of individual action, M. Renan, and quote even him on the need of State-action

> A Liberal believes in liberty, and liberty signifies the non-intervention of the State. But SUCH AN IDEAL IS STILL A LONG WAY OFF FROM US, AND THE VERY MEANS TO REMOVE IT TO AN INDEFINITE DISTANCE WOULD BE THE STATE'S WITHDRAWING ITS ACTION TOO SOON.[37]

Furthermore, Renan held that this was especially true of education [38], even more than other public affairs. Now, since Arnold understood that true liberty implied all individuals participating in the collective corporate nature of the State he, consequently, would not have agreed with the ideal of the State of Von Humboldt or of Renan. Still, he was very much at one with their practical prescriptions for contemporary State-action and, as we shall see, this was particularly so with respect to education.

iii) Social Change and the Need for Increased State Action

In the introductory essay to his 1861 The Popular Education of France, written just after he had returned from his work abroad for the Newcastle Commission where he had been very influenced by the role of the State in foreign societies, especially in the sphere of education, Arnold focused on certain changes which he felt were manifest in

English society. One of the most obvious of these changes had been the decline in the power of aristocratical parties. Indeed, he considered that circumstances in the modern period had rendered it impossible for the aristocracy to maintain its predominant sway. For the day of democracy was nigh and the change had been effected "by natural and inevitable causes" and in accordance with the desire in human nature for improvement.[39] He had been very impressed by the growth of the democratic movement in France and he believed that it was because the French State had adopted this movement that the nation was now the "lode-star of Continental democracy."[40] But with the growth of democracy in England Arnold was worried about who would assume the guiding role formerly played by the aristocracy:

> On what action may we rely to place, for some time at any rate, that action of the aristocracy upon the people of this country, which we have seen exercise an influence in many respects elevating and beneficial, but which is rapidly, and from inevitable causes, ceasing? In other words, and to use a short and significant modern expression which everyone understands, what influence may help us to prevent the English people from becoming, with the growth of democracy, AMERICANISED? I confess I am disposed to answer: on the action of the State.[41]

Anticipating the antagonistic reaction of many of his compatriots to such a solution Arnold acknowledged that State involvement in France had a tendency to be excessive [42] but he freely recognized "the coherence, rationality, and efficaciousness" of French State-action, whereas in England such action was "feeble" and characterised by "want of method, reason, and result."[43] There was no danger, however, that the English people would ever allow the power of the State to become so great as to be uncontrollable. While State-action in France might be exaggerated, the genius and temper of the English were sufficiently different to those of the French as to make such exaggeration in England impossible. For Arnold was convinced that the English were too independent and individualistic to allow the State to get excessively powerful:

> In other countries the habits and dispositions of the people may be such that the State, if once it acts, may be easily suffered to usurp exorbitantly; here they certainly are not. Here the people will always sufficiently keep in mind that any public authority is a trust delegated by themselves, for certain purposes, and with certain limits; and if that authority pretends to be an absolute, independent character, they will soon enough (and very rightly) remind it of its error.[44]

Arnold's general thrust in this essay was to stress the necessity of facing up to the immense changes which the modern spirit had introduced into society. More specifically, he insisted that the progress of England rested for the main part on increasing the power of the State and especially on involving the State to a much greater extent in public education, particularly at the secondary level just as had occurred in France. The immediate future lay with the great middle class and though he understood the antagonism of this class to State-action it was essential that this be cast aside and that the State be embraced as a friendly and beneficial agency which would work towards their transformation and improvement. However, if the middle class persisted in their spirit of individualism and remained jealous of all State action, then, he believed, they would still probably become rulers of England, for a season, but that in the process they would "Americanise" her and impair her by their low ideals and lack of culture. This in itself would be a disaster but the situation would be magnified when it was borne in mind "...that the middle classes, remaining as they are now, with their narrow, harsh, unintelligent, and unattractive spirit and culture, will almost certainly fail to mould or assimilate the masses below them, whose sympathies are at the present moment actually wider and more liberal than theirs." But it was the middle classes, considered Arnold, who were the natural educators of the lower classes and if they failed to give them the proper lead then there was the danger that social anarchy would result.[45] Consequently, he very strenuously urged the middle classes to embrace State-action.

As the 1860s progressed Arnold became increasingly aghast at his country's working class more and more embracing the maxim, which he believed was well-beloved by all classes in England, and particularly by the Utilitarians, of "doing as one likes." It was a topic which he pursued in the second chapter of Culture and Anarchy (1869) where he expatiated on his great fear that England was threading dangerous waters in permitting excessive individual liberty and the absence of an adequate control in the name of a collective interest. The French masses, he felt, though raw and uncultivated as the English, had been imbued by means of State-action with an idea of something higher than the self-will of individuals. But he was convinced that an idea of State or State-action counting for an entity superior to individual wills was far removed from the minds of the English masses. The modern spirit breaking the old feudal bonds of subordination and deference was now breeding an excessive love of freedom and liberty among the working classes with the result that "this and that man, and this and that body of men, all over the country, are beginning to assert and put in practice an Englishman's right to do what he likes; his right to march where he likes, meet where he likes, enter where he likes, hoot as he likes, threaten as he likes, smash as he likes."[46] This extreme independence and individualism was nothing other, considered Arnold, than a tendency to anarchy. But the crucial question was how was this anarchy and social dissolution to be counteracted? The answer resided in the very fount of Arnold's political, social, and educational thought, namely the notion of light being imparted by culture which would pervade society as the result of State-action. Though he did not elaborate here on how precisely the State would accomplish this, he really had in mind his firmly held conviction that it would be through the provision of a thorough State-run or public educational system that culture would be diffused among the population and excessive freedom, the doing as one likes, the growing anarchy, and the general social disintegration would be curtailed. However, he did assert that in culture stemming from State-action England would have that deeply needed principle of authority which would help to restrain the anarchical tendencies threatening society.[47]

iv) The "aliens"/"remnant" and the State

But how was this important principle of authority to be organised; who was to be entrusted with its provision? Who precisely was to control this State which would be empowered to wield authority over all? Who, in short, was to express, and in what way, the collective will of the community? The aristocracy he dismissed for, as we have seen, he insisted that its day was past. He was very conscious that he was living in an age of expansion for which light, ideas, and the feeling for how the world was going were requisite. But these attributes were lacking in the aristocracy--they were "inaccessible to ideas"--who though endowed with many great qualities were much better suited to an established, unchanging epoch of concentration, not one of expansion.[48] In like manner, when Arnold turned to a consideration of the middle classes as being the true seat of light and authority he summarily rejected them, holding that their industrialism, their "Dissidence of Dissent"[49], and their "other great works" were incompatible with the light he was seeking. In fact, their very essence kept them "from wielding an authority of which light is to be the very soul."[50] Nor indeed did Arnold consider the raw and inchoate working class capable of constituting the centre of authority for which he was striving, declaring it to be an embryo whose final development was still uncertain. Moreover, he was quite sure that at present this class could not be in possession of the requisite light which results from "culture,--that is, by reading, observing, and thinking."[51] Consequently he was satisfied that it was impossible to locate the centre of light and authority in any of the three classes, not even that class in control of the executive government.[52]

But though he was able to dismiss quickly the three main classes--Barbarians, Philistines, Populace--Arnold was still by no means clear how his desired authority would be organised, how it would transcend all individuals and all social classes, how exactly our "best self" would, in practical terms, be expressed in the State. In other words, he never really explained the everyday mechanics of "the nation in its collective and corporate character," the "organ of our collective best self, of our national right reason." He implied in Culture and Anarchy (1869) that he would provide the answer:

> But how to organise this authority, or to what hands to entrust the wielding of it? How to get your STATE, summing up the right reason of the community, and giving effect to it, as circumstances may require, with vigour? And here I think I see my enemies waiting for me with a hungry joy in their eyes. But I shall elude them.[53]

Nevertheless, he remained very ambiguous in his treatment of this question, though he did, however, discuss in a few writings, albeit briefly, his notion of a clerisy, a doctrine common in the nineteenth century and one which figured strongly in the thought of such writers as Coleridge, Carlyle, John Stuart Mill. Arnold's earliest treatment of a clerisy which he called, perhaps unhappily, the "aliens," is contained in Culture and Anarchy (1869). This was a small group of people found in all social classes who managed to transcend, for the most part, the ideas, customs, and practices of their class. They were persons who were "mainly led, not by their class spirit, but by a general HUMANE spirit, by the love of human perfection."[54] Arnold, however, did not indicate what proportion of "aliens" could be found in each class, limiting himself to the observation that "they are sown more abundantly than one might think." Moreover,

> they appear where and when one least expects it, they set up a fire which enfilades, so to speak, the class with which they are ranked; and, in general, by the extrication of their best self as the self to develop, and by the simplicity of the ends fixed by them as paramount, they hinder the unchecked predominance of that class-life which is the affirmation of our ordinary self, and seasonably disconcert mankind in their worship of machinery.[55]

But he added very little of detail about these "aliens," and certainly failed to explain what precise role they were to play in society and how exactly they were to be connected to the State. It is clear that he considered that, acting as a "powerful authority," a "serious authority," a "paramount authority," and distinguished by their "best self," they would somehow help to activate the "best self" in the rest of the population, who were at present sunk in their "ordinary self." They would somehow help to lead the rest of society to culture, to perfection. But how they were to effect this Arnold failed to explain.

Sometimes when Arnold mentioned the notion of a small intellectual, speculative, and cultured group, he merely meant that only the minority in any society would be very intelligent and very well educated. In his January 1863 "The Bishop and the Philosopher" he declared that the "highly instructed few, and not the scantily-instructed many, will ever be the organ to the human race of knowledge and truth. Knowledge and truth, in the full sense of the words, are not attainable by the great mass at all."[56] Similarly, a month later in "Dr. Stanley's Lectures on the Jewish Church," he stressed that it is only a few "whose life, whose ideal, whose demand, is thought, and thought only."[57] This sentiment was repeated in his 1864 lecture "The Function of Criticism at the Present Time," where he also suggested the importance of the intellectual few:

> The mass of mankind will never have any ardent zeal for seeing things as they are; very inadequate ideas will always satisfy them. On these inadequate ideas reposes, and must repose, the general practice of the world. That is as much as saying that whoever sets himself to see things as they are will find himself one of a very small circle; but it is only by this small circle resolutely doing its own work that adequate ideas will ever get current at all.[58]

Whether he was thinking of some specific societal clerisy here is just not clear. However, he did, indeed, refer in a number of other writings, though he never again used the term "aliens," to the concept of a clerisy and in almost the same words as those employed in Culture and Anarchy (1869). For example, in "Equality" (1878) he asserted that "scattered throughout all these classes were a certain number of generous and humane souls, lovers of man's perfection, detached from the prepossessions of the class to which they might naturally belong."[59] In 1879 in "'Ecce, Convertimur ad Gentes'" he declared that in "all classes, there are individuals with a happy nature and an instinct for the humanities of life, who stand out from their class, and who form exceptions."[60] In like manner, we read in "The Future of Liberalism" (1880) of "a few humane individuals...lovers of perfection" and later in "A Word about America" (1882) of those "lovers of the humane life, lovers of perfection, who emerge in all classes, and who, while they are more or less in conflict with the present, point to a better future."[61]

But Arnold in these works did little more than mention his notion of a clerisy; he certainly did not set forth any blue-print indicating what practical role his intellectual few should play in the everyday world. However, he did especially emphasize in "Numbers," a lecture delivered eighteen times during his 1883-1884 American tour before being published in the April 1884 issue of the Nineteenth Century, the importance of the saving "remnant" in societies. This clerisy, clearly identifiable with the "aliens" of Culture and Anarchy (1869), was essential, he was convinced, for counteracting the injurious activities of a society's "unsound majority," a majority which Arnold, increasingly authoritarian during the last decade of his life, was coming more and more to distrust. As he observed to his American audiences: "Not that your great numbers, or indeed great numbers of men anywhere, are likely to be all good, or even to have the majority good."[62] Indeed, he subscribed to the belief of Plato and Isaiah that it is the "remnant"--the word was borrowed from the latter--which "saves or destroys States," though he acknowledged that the numbers making up the "remnant" in Plato's Athens and Isaiah's Jewish State were too few to be potent. However, in modern States, Arnold believed, with overall numbers of people being so large,

> It does seem as if the remnant might be so increased as to become an actual power, even though the majority be unsound. Then the lover of wisdom may come out from under his wall, the lover of goodness will not be alone among the wild beasts. To enable the remnant to succeed, a large strengthening of its numbers is everything.[63]

But, just as in Culture and Anarchy (1869), Arnold did not elaborate on how exactly the remnant would use its power and succeed in transforming the unsound majority, did not, in short, specify what precise role it would play in saving States. However, it seemed that Arnold intended that it would not be a directly political role and that the members of the "remnant" would not be politicians as commonly understood. As he declared in the Introduction to Culture and Anarchy (1869): "I do not wish to see men of culture asking to be entrusted with power."[64] For he stressed that they would concern themselves with intellectual and moral matters not usually associated with politics. Indeed,

> the philosophers and prophets maintain that these matters, and not those of which the heads of politicians are full, do not really govern politics and save or destroy States. They save or destroy

> them by a silent, inexorable fatality; while the politicians are making believe, plausibly and noisily, with their American institutions, British Constitution, and civilising mission of France....I say, if we are to derive comfort from the doctrine of THE REMNANT (and there is great comfort to be derived from it), we must also hold fast to the austere but true doctrine as to what really governs politics, overrides with an inexorable fatality the combinations of the so-called politicians, and saves or destroys States. Having in mind things true, things elevated, things just, things pure, things amiable, things of good report; having these in mind, studying and loving these, is what saves States.[65]

So, in one very important respect, namely the study of what REALLY matters, Arnold's "remnant" had clearly much in common with Plato's Philosopher Kings. But in another significant respect they were very different. For it was an essential duty of the Philosopher Kings to take time off from their VITA CONTEMPLATIVA and employ their study in the practical VITA ATTIVA. They were in a very real sense Philosopher Rulers or Philosopher Statesmen. But Arnold made it quite clear that this was not to be the case with his clerisy.

Arnold's doctrine of the "aliens" and "remnant," though provocative, is highly ambiguous and even unsatisfactory. If not politicians, how in fact could they "recover the unsound majority?"[66] Would they be paid by the State as some branch of the Civil Service? Would they constitute some sort of "think-tank" or "brains-trust" in either a private or public capacity? Would they influence society by writing letters to The Times, preaching in churches and chapels, teaching in educational institutions? Furthermore, though Arnold seemed to believe that the State itself is an entity independent of those who compose it, just as a contract exists outside of those who sign it, it is still manifest that individuals have to run the State in some way. He, of course, acknowledged that there must be an executive to represent the community. As he wrote in the Preface to the Second Edition of Higher Schools and Universities in Germany (1874): "The proctor for a nation is the national government. The community will show its real wants most truly and naturally, and secure them best, if it acts for itself, through its proper adequate representative. And the only adequate representative of the whole community is its executive government."[67] But what precise connection would there exist between the non-political "aliens"/"remnant" and the executive government? In addition, how exactly did Arnold propose to reconcile the ambivalence over, on the one hand, his frequent championing of increased equality in society (further discussed in Chapter Four) and, on the other, his doctrine of the necessarily elite "remnant?" The existence of a clerisy would seem to signify a meritocratic rather than an egalitarian society. Did he mean that everyone in his ideal State would have an equal chance to become one of the "children of light?" But Arnold did not provide clear-cut answers to these questions apart from maintaining that the "aliens"/"remnant," whoever they were, would somehow, transcending all individuals and social classes, embody the collective "best self" of the State, that is the "nation in its collective and corporate character," and in so doing would help to lead the "ordinary self" of the majority to true culture and perfection.

v) Summary of Arnold's Interpretation of the State--Was He Totalitarian or Democrat?

When we attempt to summarize Arnold's general views on the State we find that it is no easy task. His understanding of this notion, it has often been observed, was not particularly straightforward or practical. Rather, it was a lofty, even, in some respects, mystical vision. In common with many other of his social and political proposals those referring to the State did not come provided with a neat detailed blueprint for ready adoption. That was not his way of working. How exactly the State should act in its capacity of the nation in its collective and corporate character, rising above individuals and the different social classes and representing the collective best self and the national right reason, was left unclear. But perhaps the main difficulty with his treatment of the State is that at different times he regarded this entity in a highly theoretical and, as he himself asserted, a strongly Continental fashion, as something completely separate from the Government in power and everything that entailed. On the contrary, it connoted the higher reason or "best self" of the collective and corporate society as opposed to the lower reason and "ordinary self" of the multitude. Moreover, it was clearly the role of the "aliens" or "remnant" to somehow help the multitude to understand and express their higher reason. But the fact remains that Arnold just did not elaborate how his theoretical State and his clerisy would actually function in modern England, a problem highlighted by most critics of this aspect of Arnold's thought. Mention may be made of Ben Knights who observed in The Idea of the Clerisy in the Nineteenth Century: "Matthew Arnold believed firmly in the assertion of the state, though he left few clues as to how the state was to be organised....Even the way in which the children of light were to suffuse the state with intelligence is unclear."[68] In like manner, P.J. Keating in his essay on Arnold's social and political thought concluded that from none of Arnold's views on the State and the clerisy "would it be possible to construct any kind of valid political programme and there is no point in trying to do so."[69] Again, G.H. Bantock contended that "to Arnold the state remained an idea, an aspiration, so he never really needed to question how it would actually operate."[70] However, it is also essential to emphasize that most of the time Arnold referred to the State he was thinking of an entity with a Monarch, a Parliament, Ministers, political parties, civil service, that is a State which was synonymous with a bureaucratic government. He was concerned with very practical details of various aspects of the official running of the country. Accordingly, on numerous occasions when he argued for increased State-involvement in society he had in mind specific policies to be set in motion and carried out, and institutions to be established, by the Monarch and Government in power. Indeed, the main concern in this work is with his repeated stress on the need to increase State-intervention in secondary and higher education in England and Chapter Six is a long account of his myriad prescriptions for involving the State in a very practical fashion at these educational levels.

So what connection can be made between Arnold's two distinct treatments of the State? Though he himself certainly did not spell it out in any clear manner it could be that he believed that when the ordinary, practical State will have been transformed by means of increased public intervention on the Continental model, it will then constitute in an INSTITUTIONALIZED manner, and to a greater extent than under the present conditions, the higher reason and the "best self" of the theoretical State. When more public institutions of various kinds have been established, when, for example, there has been increased State involvement in secondary and higher education in England, then there will be more intelligence, more culture, more GEIST in society. Then the "children of light," the "lovers of culture" will exist in greater abundance; then in their capacity as "aliens," as the saving "remnant," they will somehow express the "best self" of the collective character of the State. Moreover, it was the institutionalized character of the theoretical State, especially in the educational sphere, with which Arnold, comparative educator, had been impressed during his experiences on the Continent and it was aspects of this character which he wished to borrow from abroad and introduce into England.

Because of the ambiguity and, at times, lack of clarity in Arnold's treatment of the State it is perhaps not surprising that, as we have seen in Chapter One, quite different interpretations of his view of the State have been proferred ranging from the opinion that he was a most staunch defender of the liberal and democratic viewpoint to the conviction that he was a firm authoritarian and espouser of totalitarian regimes. Certainly, at times, especially in his more journalistic writings, when he was overcome by the thought of the lower classes about to effect anarchy in society, he readily called for harsh repressive measures by the Government. This was sometimes evident in the 1860s and especially in the 1880s when he was heavily occupied by the turmoil in Ireland.[71] Critics who stress this tendency declaring him to be a totalitarian who was anti-liberal, anti-Populace, anti-democratic make the mistake of only reading part of his very prolific work. For though authoritarian sentiments may be found, a careful and complete reading of Arnold's work reveals that the whole tenor of his life and writings was one which embraced the praise and the advocacy of democracy, of true liberty--in the sense of real identity with the collective and corporate character of the State, of the use of State-action to promote social harmony and to eliminate grievous inequalities between classes. State-action which was to represent the best collective nature of the whole community was to act for the benefit of all. It was by no means to be an instrument of repression. Indeed, even in his distinctly authoritarian work "Numbers" (1884) where he very strongly advocated the necessity of a clerisy, the "remnant," he did not renege on his espousal of democracy:

> It may be better, it is better, that the body of the people, with all its faults, should act for itself, and control its own affairs, than that it should be set aside as ignorant and incapable, and have its affairs managed for it by a so-called superior class, possessing property and intelligence. Property and intelligence cannot be trusted to show a sound majority themselves; the exercise of power by the people tends to educate the people.[72]

The multitude might be unsound, it might be in need of some guidance in some unspecified manner from the "remnant," but the democratic ideal must still prevail.

Arnold welcomed the decline of the old order where the aristocracy held sway, the emergence into power of the middle classes, and the surge in the natural democratic process which would eventually ensure the future leadership in society by the Populace. This was in due accordance with the Zeitgeist. Thus, whatever form his ideal State and State-action would assume in actual practice, his consistent embracing of the new democratic spirit would seem to run counter to the view that such a form would in any way be identified with any brand of totalitarianism. Nor did he desire a State-action which would be in any respect excessive. Though he was patently influenced, and quite positively so, by the role of the State in France and Germany he did not accept that it was always beneficial. For he sometimes expressed his repugnance at what he found to be an excess of State-intervention in these countries. For instance, State-involvement in the educational sector was to be admired in Bismarck's Prussia but this was by no means the case with respect to all Prussian State activities. Any action by the State in a nation was not necessarily beneficial and a panacea for society's ills. Once or twice, it should be acknowledged, Arnold revealed that he had a certain misgiving lest democracy and greater equality in England would increase the danger of repressive State power. However, as mentioned, he was invariably confident that his compatriots due to their innate qualities and to their traditions, unlike some of the Continental peoples, would never suffer the State to become repressive.

Arnold's theory of the State, it may be repeated, was difficult and he was rarely overly interested in how the theory would be translated into day to day practice. Nevertheless, with respect to the question of State-involvement in the sphere of education Arnold was much more coherent and comprehensible. His views on State educational systems, though still not providing us with an abundance of precise details, were much less lofty and remote from everyday society. When he argued for public post-elementary educational institutions he seldom, if ever, spoke of such State-action as representing the nation's collective and corporate character, though, as has been argued, it seems clear that he intended these public institutions to be an important agency for fostering the nation's "best self." His arguments were generally much more down-to-earth. State-action in education under the control of a Minister of Education on the model of certain Continental nations was now essential if England were to catch up with such foreign nations. A thorough public educational system was now a sine qua non for achieving progress in a modern society. Let us now examine the nature of this modernity which Arnold thought the State would foster.

B) Modernity and the State

i) "...modern societies need a civil organisation which is modern."[73]

As we have seen, Arnold had a thorough understanding of the momentous changes England was undergoing in passing into the modern age--"the new and changing development of modern society"[74]--and from early on he had a fervent conviction of the one thing needful which would help ease the difficult transition, namely the increased intervention of the State in certain spheres of society. Indeed, this was inevitable, for "In modern societies the agency of the State, in certain matters, is so indispensable, that it will manage, with or without our common consent, to come into operation somehow."[75] Moreover, he believed that it had certainly come into operation in a number of Continental nations. For countries such as France and Germany had gone much further than England in institutionalizing the idea of the State and their resulting civil organisations, particularly their public educational systems, had been leading agencies, he was convinced, for bringing them into greater conformity with the modern age.

One of the clearest statements of how he believed a modern society could be best attained is found in the conclusion of his 1868 Schools and Universities on the Continent where his main intention was to reveal that England had much to learn from the Continent in this regard:

> No one of open mind, and not hardened in routine and prejudice, could observe for so long and from so near as I observed it, the civil organisation of France, Germany, Italy, Switzerland, Holland, without having the conviction forced upon him that these countries have a civil organisation which has been framed with forethought and design to meet the wants of modern society; while our civil organisation in England still remains what time and chance have made it.[76]

In this regard, England resembled Austria and Rome in having

> the same easy-going and absence of system on all sides, the same powerlessness and indifference of the State, the same independence in single institutions, the same free course for abuses, the same confusion, the same lack of CO-ORDERING things, as the French say,--that is, of making them work fitly together to a fit end; the same waste of power, therefore, the same extravagance, and the same poverty of result, of which the civil organisation of England offers so many instances.[77]

The civil organisation of Austria, Rome, and England were alike in not being rationally planned and effective, a prime necessity for modern states, for Arnold insisted on the importance of remembering the right of rationality to rule over human affairs as one of the inevitable laws governing modern societies. However, all of the Continent's most progressive states, he continued, had taken the lead from France and had built or were building a new civil organisation; in this respect he pinpointed Italy, Prussia, even Russia--indeed the United States of America had come into existence "with a TABULA RASA for a modern civil organisation to be built on, and they have never had any other." However, a modern civil organisation, Arnold was adamant, was sorely lacking in England.[78] Furthermore, such a bureaucratic element was essential if ever the collective and corporate character of the State and the nation's "best self" were to be realised and expressed. In accordance with the requirements of the modern Zeitgeist Arnold's theoretical State had to be institutionalized.

ii) What did Arnold Understand by "Modern"?

Thus, very often when he talked of the rapidly changing period in which he lived Arnold chose to give to it the attribute "modern." Society was now feeling "one irresistible force ... THE MODERN SPIRIT"; this was the time "of the triumph of the modern spirit."[79] As he declared in his 1863 lecture "Heinrich Heine":

> The modern spirit is now awake almost everywhere; the sense of want of correspondence between the forms of modern Europe and its spirit, between the new wine of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, and the old bottles of the eleventh and twelfth centuries, or even of the sixteenth and seventeenth, almost every one now perceives....To remove this want of correspondence is beginning to be the settled endeavour of most persons of good sense.[80]

But what exactly did Arnold understand by this notion of "modern"? Certainly, he was not alone among his contemporaries in realising that his own age was signalling amazing changes in many spheres of life. The typical Victorian could be particularly distinguished from his predecessors in his perception of the modernity of his times and the pervasive progress which was obvious all about him. But such modernity and progress were usually equated with advances of a material nature, in the immense increase in industrialism, in the spread of urbanisation and transportation, in the availability of wealth and riches to certain segments of the community. To some, as Arnold wrote in his Preface to Mixed Essays (1879), civilisation "meant railroads and the penny post."[81] He himself was of course quite cognizant of the material benefits of such modernity; however he preferred to look to a more immaterial benefit [82] which should result from a truly modern age, an "intellectual deliverance" as he called it in his 1857 lecture "On the Modern Element in Literature":

> An intellectual deliverance is the peculiar demand of the ages which are called modern; and these nations are said to be imbued with the modern spirit most eminently in which the demand for such a deliverance has been made with most zeal, and satisfied with most completeness. Such a deliverance is emphatically, whether we will or no, the demand of the age in which we ourselves live. All intellectual pursuits our age judges according to their power of helping to satisfy this demand; of all studies it asks, above all, the question, how far they can contribute to this deliverance.[83]

Arnold went on to discuss a modern age's most characteristic features. A marked outward feature of a society in a state of advanced civilisation is the absence of constant war and bloodshed in its civil life; "repose, confidence, and free activity" is the norm. Allied to this outward characteristic is the inward one of tolerance resulting from a community's greater knowledge of and patience with "diversities of habits and opinions." A modern society is also marked by an increase in the ordinary amenities of life, in the development of taste, and the appreciation of refined pursuits. But the supreme characteristic of modernity to Arnold is "the intellectual maturity of man himself; the tendency to observe facts with a critical spirit; to search for their law, not to wander among them at random; to judge by the rule of reason, not by the impulse of prejudice or caprice."[84] For modernity, naturally, goes hand-in-hand with human progress which, as he wrote in "A French Critic on Milton" (1877), "consists in a continual increase in the number of those who, ceasing to live by the animal life alone and to feel the pleasures of sense only, come to participate in the intellectual life also, and to find enjoyment in the things of the mind."[85] Similarly, in A French Eton (1864) he remarked that "modern societies increasingly tend to find their best life in a free and heightened spiritual and intellectual activity."[86] Accordingly, "modern" really means a state of mind, the appropriate intellectual leanings, culture, or light, together with the requisite social virtues. Thus, Lionel Trilling was correct in observing that "Arnold used the word modern in a wholly honorific sense. So much so, indeed, that he seems to dismiss all temporal idea from the word and makes it signify certain timeless intellectual and civil virtues."[87] Moreover, it was in this aspect of "modern" rather than in any sense of material progress that England, in Arnold's view, had been less touched by the modern spirit than either Germany or France, falling behind the former in her relative absence of ideas and the latter in her capacity for applying them. England's lack of true modernity was especially evident, he declared in his second lecture on Homer delivered on December 8, 1860, when it was considered that with respect to the literature of these two countries, "as of the intellect of Europe in general, the main effort, for now many years, has been a CRITICAL effort; the main endeavour, in all branches of knowledge,--theology, philosophy, history, art, science,--to see the object as in itself it really is."[88] A facility for CRITICISM was one of the main attributes of the modern age and his country's inadequacy in this sphere was a problem with which he was particularly concerned throughout his life. He returned again and again to his grievance that England with all her material progress had less of the immaterial "intellectual deliverance," that especially noteworthy manifestation of the modern age, than either Germany or France and, in addition, less opportunity and ability for both nourishing and actually using such deliverance.

iii) The English Lack of "Modernity"

Arnold consistently maintained the conviction that the level of intellect, ideas, lucidity, GEIST, of his compatriots generally left much to be desired; many good qualities the English assuredly possessed but by and large they were deficient in what, in Culture and Anarchy (1869), he called "sweetness and light." For example in his 1881 "Preface to Burke" he assented to Edmund Burke's claim that the normal mental condition in England was a non-thinking one, remarking that Burke's greatest merit as a politician was his fervent attempt among the English to "'set them on thinking.'"[89] Years earlier, in a letter to his mother dated May 7, 1848, Arnold wrote of the "speculative dulness in England."[90] Almost five years later he wrote to Clough that the English were suffering from "CONGESTION OF THE BRAIN."[91]

This inadequacy in thinking rationally, in considering the natural law of things, in possessing sufficient sweetness and light, in aiming at the truth, was, in Arnold's view, one of the greatest drawbacks in England. As he declared in "A Liverpool Address" delivered in September 1882 at the commencement of winter term of Liverpool University College, "our own great want was lucidity," lucidity being a favourite word of his.[92] Moreover, lucidity was a quality possessed in good measure by the French, though they lacked the great seriousness with which the English were imbued and, in fact, tended to undervalue it. (Arnold, it must be reiterated, was no uncritical idolater of the French).[93] Though he considered that this English seriousness was "invaluable" he also insisted that it must be complemented by lucidity. "Both the one and the other are valuable, and, in the end, indispensable."[94] He defined lucidity in a negative manner, declaring that it is the realisation that long accepted and customary beliefs may no longer be true and valid, that their day is past and that they no longer are useful. Voltaire, he maintained was the great exponent of this negative lucidity who, though he did great harm by his want of seriousness, accomplished good by its means.[95] But the English by no means possessed the same leaning towards lucidity as the French; in fact, speaking of England Arnold could say: "'In no country in the world is so much nonsense so firmly believed.'"[96] At any rate, though he admitted that lucidity by itself is very far from being "a satisfying possession" he was convinced

> that it is inevitable and indispensable, and that it is the condition of all serious construction for the future. Without it, at present, a man or a nation is intellectually and spiritually all abroad. If we see it accompanied in France by much that we shrink from, we should reflect that in

> England it will have influences joined with it which it has not in France--the natural seriousness of our people, their sense of reverence and respect, their love for the past. Come it must; and here, where it has been so late in coming, it will probably be for the first time seen to come without danger.[97]

Similarly, in his 1877 essay on the Civil War hero Lucius Cary, Viscount Falkland, Arnold had written that Falkland's brand of lucidity and noble temper would someday be victorious, though that day was still far in the future:

> Slowly, very slowly, his ideal of lucidity of mind and largeness of temper conquers; but it conquers. In the end it will prevail; only we must have patience. The day will come when this nation shall be renewed by it. But, O lime-trees of Yew, and quiet Oxfordshire field-banks where the fresh violets are even now raising their heads!--how often, ere that day arrive for Englishmen, shall your renewal be seen! [98]

Though the appearance of lucidity among the English was seen to be inevitable by Arnold, he rarely gave any indication that more than a modicum of it had ever arrived. It is true that in a December 1873 address, published the following February as "A Speech at Westminster," after criticizing the unsatisfactory mental condition of his countrymen, he claimed that they were indeed in the process of waking up, were, in short, beginning to think better and to become more lucid.[99] Still, right up to the last years of his life he continued to complain of their mental condition. In his 1885 essay, "A Word More about America" he was again dismissive of the paltry amount of lucidity and of the myopic intellectual vision to be found among the English.[100] In 1887, in "From Easter to August," he wrote that, though possessed of a thousand good qualities, they were "perhaps, a good deal wanting in lucidity and flexibility."[101] The following year, the last year of his life, in the article "Disestablishment in Wales," he reiterated an old criticism that energy and honesty were England's national characteristics [102] and not lucidity and logic. As he furthermore remarked, "it is not enough recognized that a thing's being absurd is really an objection to it."[103] This is reminiscent of his complaint expressed in The Popular Education of France (1861) more than two and a half decades previously where he had spoken of the English "judicious contempt of logic."[104]

Though always acknowledging that the French were by no means devoid of faults Arnold again and again bestowed on them especial praise for their rationality, their lucidity, their "intellectual deliverance." This was in marked contrast to his opinion on the English mental state. In his 1863 lecture "Heinrich Heine" he noted with approval the poet's belief that the French people have been in the forefront of nations in displaying accessibility to ideas, in being less constrained than others by the bonds of prescription and routine, and in their willingness to follow the dictates of reason.[105] Still, he believed that France was not the only nation with a penchant for ideas, declaring that Germany was a "vast mine of ideas" and that if Heine had imported ideas from France into that country it would have been as if he had carried coals to Newcastle. But the Germans, Arnold observed, were somewhat weak with respect to the practical application of ideas, especially when compared with the French, for not only was there an accessibility to ideas in France, her countrymen were eminent in their "prompt, ardent, and practical application" of them.[106] The English, on the contrary, were severely castigated as being far behind both the French and the Germans in their accessibility to ideas, in their employment of reason and for their belief that the Land of Promise is Philistia.[107] These shortcomings, he felt, would tell heavily against England's progress and would create barriers between her and more rational nations. A year later in "The Literary Influence of Academies" (1864) he concluded that the main characteristics of the English spirit were energy and honesty but that an open and clear mind, a quick and flexible intelligence could by no means be counted as essential.[108] However, such openness of mind and flexibility of intelligence, formerly characteristic of the ancient Athenians, were now particularly noticeable among the modern French--the French, in fact, "strikingly characterise them as compared with us."[109] Similarly, in his Oxford lecture on Joubert of seven months earlier he had declared that the French display a sympathy for intellectual matters for their own sake and for their own intrinsic pleasure and beauty, a sympathy "keener than any which exists in England."[110]

Years earlier in a letter to Arthur Hugh Clough on March 6, 1848 Arnold wrote of

> .this WIDE AND DEEPSPREAD INTELLIGENCE that makes the French seem to themselves in the van of Europe....the final expression up to the present time of European opinion, without fantastic individual admixture, was CURRENT there: not emergent here and there in a great writer,--but the ATMOSPHERE of the commonplace man as well as of the Genius. This is the secret of their power: our weakness is that in an age where all tends to the triumph of the logical absolute reason we neither courageously have thrown ourselves into this movement like the French: nor yet have driven our feet into the solid ground of our individuality as spiritual, poetic, profound PERSONS. Instead of

> this we have stood UP hesitating: seeming to refuse the first line on the ground that the second is our NATURAL one--yet not taking this. How long halt ye between two opinions: woe to the modern nation, which will neither be philosophe nor philosopher. Eh? [111]

Moreover, Arnold believed that French intellectual superiority was evident just as much in their lower as in their middle and upper classes. Four days after his letter to Clough he wrote as follows to his eldest sister:

> You must by this time begin to see what people mean by placing France POLITICALLY in the van of Europe; it is the INTELLIGENCE of their IDEA-MOVED MASSES which makes them, politically, as far superior to the INSENSIBLE MASSES of England as to the Russian serfs, and at the same time they do not threaten the educated world with the intolerable LAIDEUR of the well-fed American masses, so deeply anti-pathetic to continental Europe.[112]

Similarly in his 1859 political essay "England and the Italian Question" he pointed out that even the French masses were accessible to elevated ideas, something which distinguished France from all other countries, though he considered that their actual knowledge fell behind their intellectual ability.[113] A couple of years later in The Popular Education of France (1861) Arnold wrote: "The intelligence of the French people is well known; in spite of their serious faults, in spite of their almost incredible ignorance, it places them among the very foremost of ancient or modern nations."[114]

Though Arnold on a number of occasions displayed his antipathy to what he regarded as the pedantry of the Prussian people [115] it is clear that he was generally impressed with the mental condition of the Germans nearly as much as with that of the French. As he wrote in "Equality" (1878), the Germans were endowed with the attributes of knowing things SCIENTIFICALLY, "of knowing them systematically, by the regular and right process, and in the only real way."[116] Earlier in his 1866 On the Study of Celtic Literature he spoke of "the scientific, serious German spirit, not carried away by this and that intoxication of ear, and eye, and self-will."[117] Referring to this in a letter to his mother in July of that year, he commented: "The moment is altogether one of surpassing interest. How the revival of Germany would have excited dear Papa. What I have said in one of my Celtic papers,--the idea of science governing every department of human activity,--is the root and heart of Prussia's success at this moment."[118] Again, in the preface to the first edition of Literature and Dogma (1873) he wrote that to obtain the facts in most spheres of science, but especially in the realms of theology and Biblical study, it is to Germany that one proceeds: "Germany, and it is to her high honour, has searched out the facts and exhibited them."[119] Arnold elsewhere praised the Germans for their good critical taste. Criticising an English work of scholarship, he wrote that "an extravagance of this sort would never come from Germany, where there is a great force of critical opinion controlling a learned man's vagaries, and keeping him straight."[120] Thus, while he was manifestly ambivalent regarding certain aspects of the character and culture of the Germans (as of the French), it is also patent that with respect to their attitude towards intellect, light, ideas, that is the "intellectual deliverance" which he considered to be such an important part of modernity, he placed them far in front of the English. He expressed this belief very clearly in his 1863 lecture "Heinrich Heine":

> A chosen circle of children of the modern spirit, perfectly emancipated from prejudice and commonplace, regarding the ideal side of things in all its efforts for change, passionately despising half-measures and condescension to human folly and obstinacy,--with a bewildered, timid, torpid multitude behind,--conducts a country to the government of Herr von Bismarck. A nation regarding the practical side of things in its efforts for change, attacking not what is irrational, but what is pressingly inconvenient, and attacking this as one body, "moving together if it move at all," and treating children of light like the very harshest of stepmothers, comes to the prosperity and liberty of modern England.[121]

In fine, it is clear that for Arnold a really modern society was one which had achieved that immaterial progress connoted by the world of intellect and ideas. Modernity did not necessarily mean an abundance of material advances. For it was because of their "intellectual deliverance" that France and Germany were far more modern than his own England. Moreover, a paramount reason, he was convinced, why these nations had attained such a deliverance was due to their ardent embracing of the State. In these countries, "the idea of the State, of the nation in its collective and corporate character, instituting means for developing and dignifying the national life, has great power."[122] But while the acceptance of the idea of the State itself signified the possession of lucidity, it was because they had established a sound civil organisation, that is the bureaucratic nature of the State, that they so firmly attained their intellectual enlightenment and modernity. In England, however, not only was the idea of the State quite foreign, but there was little chance that it would ever be understood and espoused while the civil organisation of that country was so rudimentary. Consequently, if the collective and corporate character of the State were ever to be fully realised, if the "best self" of the nation were to be expressed, if the "children of the modern spirit" were to be heard and true modernity attained, then England must increase its State involvement in society. In short, the idea of the State must be institutionalized.

iv) State Schools an Important Agency for Effecting Modernity

In the Conclusion to Schools and Universities on the Continent (1868) Arnold wrote: "But the English reader will hardly, I think, have accompanied me through my long course, without sharing the conclusion that at any rate a public system of schools is indispensable in modern communities."[123] It was through education that a nation's modern spirit, the requisite intellectual temper, was best nourished--as he declared in the Conclusion to Culture and Anarchy (1869): "education is the road to culture"[124]--and he firmly believed that it was a State public educational system which was one of the leading agencies for bringing a nation most quickly and surely into the modern age. Moreover, this was a belief with which he was especially imbued from his experiences abroad.

Arnold focused on this relation between modernity, educational institutions, and the State in A French Eton (1864):

> For public establishments modern societies have to betake themselves to the State; that is, to THEMSELVES IN THEIR COLLECTIVE AND CORPORATE CHARACTER. On the Continent, society has thus betaken itself to the State for the establishment of education. The result has been the formation of institutions like the Lyceum of Toulouse; institutions capable of great improvement, by no

> means to be extolled absolutely, by no means to be imitated just as they are; but institutions formed by modern society, with modern modes of operation, to meet modern wants; and in some important respects, at any rate, meeting those wants.[125]

He was obviously implying here that if England were to become truly modern she must adopt a State educational system on the general lines of those found in European nations. Indeed, as we have seen, the superiority of Continental State educational provision, especially secondary, was frequently stressed by Arnold. For example, in "An Unregarded Irish Grievance" (1881) he argued that the miserable inadequacy of English and Irish middle class education could only be rectified "by being treated as a public service, as a service for which the State, the nation in its collective and corporate character, is responsible. This proposition I have often advanced and sufficiently expounded. To me its truth seems self-evident, and the practice of other countries is present, besides, to speak for it." For middle class education as a public service was something which all the civilised nations on the Continent found indispensable.[126] But England, in Arnold's opinion, by denying to the State its rightful involvement in the sphere of education and by maintaining institutions more suited to the Middle Ages than the modern epoch was falling dramatically behind certain Continental nations.[127] For, on the Continent it was the great merit of the French Revolution, in Arnold's eyes, to overthrow the Middle Ages with all their archaic establishments and, in like manner, Napoleon's great merit, "the great merit he rendered to Europe, was TO FOUND A CIVIL ORGANISATION FOR MODERN SOCIETY. With all his faults, his reason was so clear and strong that he saw, in its general outline at least, the just and rational type of civil organisation which modern society needs, and wherever his armies went, he instituted it."[128] An essential constituent part of this civil organisation, the Code Napoléon, was a thorough educational system covering all levels. In Italy, according to Arnold, Cavour well knew how necessary a good system of public education was in the regeneration of that country, acknowledging "that in modern times the State cannot remain a stranger to this institution."[129] Similarly, Arnold was impressed by the educational efforts of Bismarck and his government which had built on the great foundation earlier established by Wilhelm Von Humboldt in leading Germany into the modern era. He also had high praise for the public educational system of even small Switzerland which was aiding that nation on the road to future civilisation:

> Meanwhile let us be grateful to any country, which, like Switzerland, prepares by a broad and sound system of popular education the indispensable foundations on which a civilising culture may in the future be built; and do not let us be too nice, while we ourselves have not even laid the indispensable foundations, in canvassing the spirit in which others have laid them.[130]

Thus, Arnold was very impressed with Continental State educational provision which he considered was most instrumental in leading these countries into the modern age and he was indefatigable in his resolution that England should emulate such foreign practices and expand the aegis of the State in the educational sphere. For only through a State-run educational system could England hope to attain that true modernity and its "intellectual deliverance" promised by the new modern spirit, clear evidence of which he had perceived in Continental Europe.

C) Arnold on the Antagonism of the English to the Idea of the State and State-action, Particularly in the Sphere of Education

Convinced though he was of the great need to introduce more State intervention in English society, Arnold was very well aware that any such suggestion was bound to encounter vociferous opposition. He knew that the State, or "Machiavel as we English think it" [131] was a great BÊTE NOIRE to many of his compatriots, not least because it was viewed as a notion distinctly Continental and most un-English. As Lionel Trilling remarked, Arnold might just "as well have told the English middle class that only Popery or Mohammedanism could save the national life from meanness as that in the State lay spiritual salvation."[132] On February 16, 1864 he wrote to his mother that the *Nonconformist*, Miall's journal for Dissenters, had declared he was totally ignorant of the antagonism to State intervention; it was a charge he denied: "But I have--of the depth of the feeling among the DISSENTING MINISTERS who have hitherto greatly swayed the middle class."[133] Moreover, in a number of his writings he revealed a thorough understanding of the historical and sociological reasons for the antagonism of so many English to State-involvement. In his introductory essay to *The Popular Education of France* (1861) and in *Culture and Anarchy* (1869) he asserted that it was in the nature of an aristocracy, particularly a large one, to be jealous of a strong State-power.[134] As he later wrote in "'Ecce, Convertimur ad Gentes'" (1879), an aristocracy grants, as far as possible, control over their own affairs to individuals and localities. The English "aristocratic system may have its faults," he continued, "but the mania for State-interference everywhere is not one of them."[135] On the other hand, as he observed in *A French Eton* (1864), he deemed that the English working classes had no real objection to State-action:

> Quite the contrary. They often greatly embarrass their Liberal friends and patrons from other classes, one of whose favourite catchwords is NO STATE-INTERFERENCE, by their resolute refusal to adopt this Shibboleth, to embrace this article of their patron's creed. They will join with them in their Liberalism, not in their crotchets. Left to themselves, they are led, as by their plain interest, so, too, by their natural disposition, to welcome the action of the State in their behalf.[136]

Still, the English aristocracy did not stand alone in their attitude towards State-action, for the middle classes, and particularly their kernel, the Protestant Dissenters, also shared this disposition. Moreover, Arnold acknowledged on a number of occasions that a brief perusal of English history would render it quite understandable why the middle class Nonconformists were leery of State-action. For, as he observed in the Introduction to The Popular Education of France (1861), the English Government had often intervened on the side of the aristocratical and High Church party with the Dissenters or Puritans being invariably the ones who had suffered. Accordingly, it was easy, Arnold maintained, to comprehend why this latter group had identified State-action with such legislature as the Conventicle Act, the Five-Mile Act, the Act of Uniformity. Having been discriminated against by the State the Dissenters had tended to regard all State-action as unjust, cruel and not to be trusted.[137] Likewise, in A French Eton (1864), he referred to the history of the troubled relationship between the Dissenting middle class and the State:

> The stronghold of Nonconformity then, as now, was in the middle class; in its struggle to repel the conformity forced upon it, the middle class underwent great suffering and injustice; and it has

> never forgotten them....The State tried to do it violence, so it does not love the State; the State failed to subdue it, so it does not respect the State. It regards it with something of aversion and something of contempt. It professes the desire to limit its function as much as possible, to restrict its action to matters where it is indispensably necessary to make of it a mere tax-collector and policeman--the hewer of wood and drawer of water to the community.[138]

Thus, Arnold made it clear that he viewed the English upper and middle classes to be at one in warding off any increase in State power, the former feeling that their authority and grandeur would be circumscribed and eclipsed by those of the State, the latter viewing the State as an agency of oppression. The obvious result: "LEAVE US TO OURSELVES! magnates and middle classes alike cried to the State."[139]

Accordingly, Arnold knew well, better than most perhaps, that the English were apt to display "a jealousy of all high-handed proceedings on the part of the State."[140] He acknowledged that England had never accepted the notion of the State which pertained in the Old Roman Empire and asserted that it would be useless to attempt to introduce it there. He agreed, in common with most of his countrymen, "that OVER-GOVERNMENT is pernicious and dangerous; that the State cannot safely be trusted to undertake everything, to superintend everywhere." But he also indicated that UNDER-GOVERNMENT had its own inconveniences.[141] Thus, a major problem in Arnold's eyes was the tendency of many English to regard ALL State-action with aversion. A common catchword, he declared in A French Eton (1864), "The State had better leave things alone," was constantly heard as an absolute maxim. However, he insisted that such a proposition carries

> no absolute force; it merely conveys a notion which

> certain people have generalised from certain facts which have come under their observation, and which, by a natural vice of the human mind, they are then prone to apply absolutely. Some things the State had better leave alone, others it had better not. Is this particular thing one of these, or one of those?--that, as to any particular thing, is the right question. Now, I say, that education is one of those things which the State ought not to leave alone, which it ought to establish.[142]

It is clear that Arnold did not wish State-action in all spheres of society, but only in some of them, with education being one of these.

Of course, Arnold fully realised that it would be a long formidable struggle to convince his compatriots of his views on the efficacy of increased State-action in society. But if the general idea of the State was anathema to them, very much also was the espousal of greater State involvement in education, and it was an antagonism which existed to a strong degree throughout all of Arnold's life. At his birth, 1822, the State played no part at all in England's educational provision--State-action only commenced in 1833--and even when he died, 1888, England was lagging behind many of her European neighbours with respect to the extent of State-intervention in education. In fact, State-action at the secondary level had to wait for its commencement until the next century, 1902. Arnold himself was under no illusions regarding the role of the State in his own country. In "'Ecce, Convertimur ad Gentes'" (1879), he wrote: "There is a Latin law-maxim which tells us that it is the business of a good judge to seek to extend his jurisdiction: BONI JUDICIS EST AMPLIARE JURISDICTIONEM. That may be characteristic of a good judge, but it is not characteristic of a British Government in domestic affairs generally, certainly not in the concerns of education."[143] In his 1877 review of Dr. L. Wiese's

Deutsche Briefe über Englische Erziehung (German Letters on English Education) (1876) he agreed with Wiese's conviction that the main problem with England's education was its poor organisation, its want of a "unity of plan, and a firm guiding hand."[144] Stressing the English "terror of bureaucracy and authoritative State-guidance" Arnold declared:

> The State has been the great bugbear. Englishmen do not want, they say, to have a paternal Government meddling with their schools and directing them. Or, at any rate, if the poor require it, the middle and upper classes do not. These classes will manage their schools for themselves. At last, however, Englishmen open their eyes to see that in this way they have got a few good schools and a multitude of very bad ones. Some norm-giving agency, some common standard for testing the work of schools, some guarantee of their efficiency, are absolutely needed. The State is not to be thought of.[145]

Accordingly, he was fully cognizant of the awesome difficulties he was bound to encounter in his attempt to persuade his countrymen to emulate their Continental neighbours with regard to State-action. For example, in the Preface to Schools and Universities on the Continent (1868) he declared that there existed two widely held opinions among the English which hindered them from benefiting from a consultation of Continental State-action. The first was the English view "of the State as an alien intrusive power in the community, not summing up and representing the action of individuals, but thwarting it." Though he considered that this view was less strong than formerly he felt it appropriate to quote from a foreign Report on the nature of the State: "Le Gouvernement ne représente pas un intérêt particulier, distinct, puisqu'il est au contraire la plus haute et la plus sincère expression de tous les intérêts généraux du pays."[146] This, he held, was the true nature of a government and he advised citizens against expending their energies in getting "rid of so powerful and essential an agency." The second opinion blinding the English to the advantages of Continental State-action was their high regard for their own energy and wealth. Acknowledging that such a regard was justified, he asserted, however, that energy and wealth were not enough for they required intelligence to complement them.[147]

It is perhaps amusing to read of Arnold's reports that early in the life of the Committee of Council a clergyman insisted that he would not allow an inspector of Lord John Russell, "'or any other Turkish Bashaw,'" into his schools, and also that Archbishop Denison threatened the school inspector with drowning in a horsepond.[148] Being an inspector himself and possessed of a sound sense of humour and "vivacity," Arnold probably relished these stories. However, he admitted that though these individuals "were eccentric men, living in a fantastic world of their own" [149], they by no means stood in isolation in their display of strong opposition to State intervention in education. In A French Eton, published in 1864 over 30 years after the first State grant, he mentioned the views of those whose plaints revolved about the baneful influence of the State on everything with which it comes into contact when it endeavours to do for private individuals what these individuals could do much better on their own. This attitude he found in not so eccentric sources, for example, The Times: "'The State can hardly aid education without cramping and warping its growth, and mischievously interfering with the laws of its natural development;'" and Frederick Temple, respectively Inspector of Schools, Headmaster of Rugby, and Archbishop of Canterbury: "'Why should persons in Downing Street be at all better qualified than the rest of the world for regulating these matters?'"[150] There is no doubt that such slighting and snubbing of State-action was encountered very frequently by Arnold and it was in answering such criticism that he devoted much of his life both as an inspector and as an writer. However, he never lost his strongly held conviction that the State would eventually prevail, an attitude which he manifested in a letter published on December 11, 1865 in the Pall Mall Gazette under the pseudonym "A Lover of Light":

> The notion that to establish elementary schools for the "people of the land" is the State's duty--that it has no right to hand over this duty to the "noblemen and gentry of the diocese"--that the people suffers in its liberty, its self-respect, its education, when the State's duty is so handed over--this notion suits the prejudices and preponderance of some persons very ill, and therefore they would gladly extinguish it if they could. But it is sound; and therefore, in spite of hostility, it will live. It will thrive, it will strengthen. Tons of regulation claptrap about the "colossal official education of continental countries," about "the local diversity and independent energy which are such vital characteristics of our national life," will not be able to crush it. [151]

Of course, the 1870 Education Act proved him correct and writing years later in 1881 in "An Unregarded Irish Grievance" he observed that the day was now past when people talked scornfully of public elementary schools as having a "State-taint" upon them. However, this was by no means the case for secondary or middle class instruction where talk of a "State-taint" was still popular. But, insisted Arnold, to make such instruction a public service was now essential for England's well-being though he realised that the Englishman's and especially the English middle classes' individualism, independence, and antagonism to State-intervention were still strong, with voluntaryism in as many spheres as possible being still the ideal. For the middle classes were epitomised by the likes of Dickens' Murdstone and Quinion who

> ...with their strong individuality and their peculiar habits of life, do not want things instituted by the State, by the nation acting in its collective and corporate character. They do not want State schools, or State Festivals, or State theatres. They prefer their Salem House, and their meeting, and their music-hall, and to be congratulated by Lord Frederick Cavendish upon their energy and self-reliance.[152]

Once again, he acknowledged that the great portion of the middle class which had embraced a Puritan religion since the Reformation had had little reason over the years to feel gratitude to the action of the State and that they were now fearful that State schools would display a continued discrimination against their religion.[153] But it was a narrow civilisation, he contended, which had resulted out of the combination of their religion and their other great interest, business, and he was obviously sarcastic in his observation that to their life the middle class was "apprehensive that the wider ideas and larger habits of public schools might not be favourable."[154] But it was wider ideas and larger habits of which Arnold was particularly insistent that the middle classes were most in need if their nation were to develop and become as progressive and modern as other European ones. For it was the middle classes, now England's rulers, who were particularly in need of an "intellectual deliverance." In addition, they had to provide suitable models to be emulated by the lower classes who would soon enough assume the reins of government. At any rate, Arnold was fully convinced that this "intellectual deliverance" and broader civilisation could only be attained if the middle classes looked to the Continent and borrowed the notion of the State. For England's future well-being depended on her people, and especially the members of the middle classes, being better able to express their "best self," something which would be most effectively accomplished by the increased institutionalization of the State. Moreover, he believed, though realising tht it might take a long time before these middle classes acquiesced in the question of public schools for their children, that the most powerful State institutions would be in the sphere of education, particularly at the secondary and higher levels.

Throughout his life Arnold persisted in condemning the middle classes and in calling again and again for a thorough transformation of what he regarded as their unsatisfactory nature. Since he saw these classes as the key to England's future, it is now necessary to examine carefully why exactly their culture seemed so resistant to his conception of progress.

REFERENCES

1. See Geoffrey Carnall, "Matthew Arnold's 'Great Critical Effort,'" Essays in Criticism 8, No. 3 (July 1958):256.

2. "My Countrymen," Prose Works 5:4.

3. Culture and Anarchy, Prose Works 5:126. However, in Letter VII of Friendship's Garland Arnold called Harrison's strictures "unjustifiably severe." (Friendship's Garland, Prose Works 5:76).

4. Culture and Anarchy Prose Works 5:192, 137, 137, 194.

5. "A Word More about America," Prose Works 10:194. As Albert J. Lubell writes: "It seems scarcely necessary to say that, while Arnold at his best is a philosophical poet of stature, he was never, either by temperament or training, a philosopher. As his Notebooks attest, even his general interest in philosophy, at least in its more technical aspects, seems to have flagged in his later years. Nor are the strictures some critics pass upon him for a certain lack of rigor in his thinking--a lack which a more thorough philosophic training might presumably have bolstered--without foundation. Writers of a philosophic cast of mind rather than philosophers--Goethe, Senancour, Renan, Sainte-Beuve--claimed his attention more and more as he was maturing in his late twenties and early thirties." [Albert J. Lubell, "Matthew Arnold: Between Two Worlds," Modern Language Quarterly 22, No. 3 (Sept. 1961):252].

6. Conclusion to Culture and Anarchy, Prose Works 5:227. See also Dedicatory Letter to Friendship's Garland, Prose Works 5:355.

7. "Irish Catholicism and British Liberalism," Prose Works 8:327.

8. "'Ecce, Convertimur ad Gentes,'" Prose Works 9:6.

9. Preface to Irish Essays, Prose Works 9:312; letter to his mother, October 17, 1871, Russell, Letters 2:67. Referring to the members of the Taunton Commission in a December, 1864 letter, Arnold wrote that it "will be full of people who have declared themselves beforehand against State-intervention....But I wish it was a better and more open-minded Commission. But this, like all else which happens, more and more turns me away from the thought of any attempt at direct practical and political action, to tell upon people's minds, which after all is the great thing, hard as it is to make oneself fully believe it so." [Letter to his mother, December 1, 1864, The A.K. Davis-Matthew Arnold Collection, Univ. of Virginia Library, No. 4885, Box 15, (Ms. Kirsch's transcript); see also Super, Prose Works 4:345]. Six months earlier he also dissociated himself from direct involvement: "I see that I am making an impression by what I have said of the middle classes and their spirit, and something, perhaps, will sooner or later be effected, but I cannot join associations and read papers as they want me to; that is not my

line of working." [Letter to his mother, July 14, 1864, The A.K. Davis-Matthew Arnold Collection, Univ. of Virginia Library, No. 4885, Box 15 (Ms. Kirsch's transcript)]. Indeed, his official duties, he held, were at times incompatible with public action: "I think there is inconvenience in a subordinate officer of the Education Department, such as a school inspector, taking part in public meetings on the subject of education, and therefore I must decline your kind invitation for the 11th." [Letter to Mr. (F.W.?) Bourne, May 5, 1874, The A.K. Davis-Matthew Arnold Collection, Univ. of Virginia Library, No. 4885, Box 18].

10. Letter to James Bryce, April 6, 1880, Allan B. Lefcowitz and Laurance W. Mazzeno, "Matthew Arnold and James Bryce," The Arnoldian 10, No. 1 (Winter 1982):32.

11. Park Honan, Matthew Arnold: A Life, (Camb. Mass.: Harvard Univ. Press, 1983; 1st pub., New York: McGraw-Hill, 1981), p. 468, note 52.

12. Introd. to The Popular Education of France, Prose Works 2:26-27.

13. Culture and Anarchy, Prose Works 5:117.

14. Ibid., p. 135.

15. Introd. to The Popular Education of France, Prose Works 2:28-29.

16. Culture and Anarchy, Prose Works 5:136.

17. Ibid., pp. 223-224.

18. The Popular Education of France, Prose Works 2:157. Later in this work Arnold wrote: "In England the State is perhaps inclined to admit too readily its powerlessness as inevitable. It too easily resigns itself to believe that there exists in the country no such thing as a party of reason, capable of upholding a government which should boldly throw itself upon it for support. Perhaps such a party exists; perhaps it is stronger than governments think. No doubt the State has in this country to confront, when it attempts to act, great suspicion, great jealousy. But in other countries, also, it has had its adversaries to contend with; and it has, sometimes, even when most despotic, relied for success not on superior brute force, but on an arm which the most constitutional State might blamelessly wield--on superior reason." (Ibid., pp. 210-211). Arnold was here particularly in mind of Napoleon's Consular legislation of 1802.

19. Ibid., p. 158.

20. It was with a similar sentiment that Arnold ended his section on Italy in Schools and Universities on the Continent, declaring that in the sphere of education the government's duty was "not to fear and flatter ignorance, prejudice, and obstructiveness, but

COMPREHENDERE, ED INSINUARE NELLO SPIRITO PUBBLICO, CHE UNA BUONA ORGANIZZAZIONE DEGLI STUDI, E LA GRANDEZZA INTELLETTUALE DI UNA NAZIONE, SONO I PIÙ SALDI FONDAMENTI DELLA POTENZA DEGLI STATI E DELLA VERA E ORDINATA LIBERTÀ DEI POPOLI." (Schools and Universities on the Continent, Prose Works 4:182).

21. "Dr. Stanley's Lectures on the Jewish Church," Prose Works 3:78.

22. "Education and the State (II)," Letter to the Pall Mall Gazette, December 22, 1865, Prose Works 4:5-6.

23. "'Ecce, Convertimur ad Gentes,'" Prose Works 9:16.

24. Ibid., p. 15.

25. Ibid., p. 15.

26. Ibid., p. 15. In a Dec. 15, 1878 letter to M. Fontanès, a French ecclesiastic, Arnold discoursed on the different roles of the State in both France and England and on the different theory and practice of individual liberty in these two countries: "I suppose your thoughts, in France, must turn a good deal upon the over-meddling of the State, and upon the need of developing more the action of individuals. With us the mischief has, I am convinced, been the other way. The State has not enough shown a spirit of initiative, and individuals have too much thought that it sufficed if they acted with entire liberty and if nobody had any business to control them. The sort of action which has thus become common amongst us--action at once so resolute and so unintelligent--produces the spectacle which made Goethe, who nevertheless liked and admired England greatly, say, 'Der Engländer ist eigentlich ohne Intelligenz.'
Therefore I have always wished to make the State the organ of the best self and highest reason of the community, rather than to reduce the State to insignificance, and to cultivate, in fact, the American ideal. I see that Gambetta, in his speech at Rouen, guarded himself against being taken for a pronounced enemy of your centralisation, and said that to your centralisation you owed a great deal; and I think he was right. Only you do certainly require to cultivate the side of individual character and activity more than, perhaps, you have done." (Russell, Letters 2:149-150). Arnold certainly wanted England to learn from France but he was not blind to problems in that country also.

27. "Joubert," Prose Works 3:207.

28. Letter to his mother, July 27, 1866, Russell, Letters 1:335.

29. Preface to Mixed Essays, Prose Works 8:371.

30. A French Eton, Prose Works 2:314.

31. Ibid., p. 300.

32. Ibid., p. 300.

33. Ibid., p. 301.

34. "The Twice-Revised Code," *Prose Works* 2:234.

35. *A French Eton*, *Prose Works* 2:310.

36. *Culture and Anarchy*, *Prose Works* 5:161.

37. Ibid., p. 162.

38. Lowry, Young, Dunn, *Note-Books*, p. 29.

39. Introd. to *The Popular Education of France*, *Prose Works* 2:6-7. See also Introd. to *On the Study of Celtic Literature*, *Prose Works* 3:390. As Arminius declared: "countries must outgrow a feudal organisation, and the political command of an aristocracy; your country has outgrown it." (*Friendship's Garland*, Letter IX, *Prose Works* 5:330).

40. Introd. to *The Popular Education of France*, *Prose Works* 2:11.

41. Ibid., pp. 15-16.

42. See Ibid., p. 10. Also "'Ecce, Convertimur ad Gentes,'" *Prose Works* 9:15.

43. Introd. to *The Popular Education of France*, *Prose Works* 2:16-17.

44. Ibid., p. 18.

45. Ibid., p. 26.

46. *Culture and Anarchy*, *Prose Works* 5:119.

47. Ibid., p. 123.

48. Ibid., pp. 124-127.

49. "The Dissidence of Dissent, and the Protestantism of the Protestant religion" was the motto of the *Nonconformist*, Edward Miall's weekly newspaper. See *St. Paul and Protestantism*, *Prose Works* 6:114; also p. 442.

50. *Culture and Anarchy*, *Prose Works* 5:130.

51. Ibid., p. 132.

52. Ibid., p. 134.

53. Ibid., pp. 123-124.

54. Ibid., p. 146.

55. Ibid., p. 146.

56. "The Bishop and the Philosopher," Prose Works 3:43-44.

57. "Dr. Stanley's Lectures on the Jewish Church," Prose Works 3:66.

58. "The Function of Criticism at the Present Time," Prose Works 3:274.

59. "Equality," Prose Works 8:283.

60. "'Ecce, Convertimur ad Gentes,'" Prose Works 9:9.

61. "The Future of Liberalism," Prose Works 9:151-152; also Ibid., p. 158; "A Word about America," Prose Works 10:5. See also "'Porro Unum Est Necessarium,'" Prose Works 8:368; "The Incompatibles," Prose Works 9:240-241.

62. "Numbers," Prose Works 10:144.

63. Ibid., p. 150.

64. Culture and Anarchy, Prose Works 5:88.

65. "Numbers," Prose Works 10:152.

66. Ibid., p. 163.

67. Preface to the Second Edition of Higher Schools and Universities in Germany, Prose Works 7:117.

68. Ben Knights, The Idea of the Clerisy in the Nineteenth Century (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1978), p. 135.

69. P.J. Keating, "Arnold's Social and Political Thought," Matthew Arnold, ed. K. Allott (London: Bell & Sons, 1975), pp. 228-229.

70. Bantock, 1984, p. 202.

71. See for example: "The Nadir of Liberalism," Prose Works 11:56; "The Zenith of Conservatism," Prose Works 11:136-138; "Up to Easter," Prose Works 11:passim; "From Easter to August," Prose Works 11:254, 257.

72. "Numbers," Prose Works 10:145.

73. Schools and Universities on the Continent, Prose Works 4:306.

74. A French Eton, Prose Works 2:305.

75. Ibid., p. 309.

76. Schools and Universities on the Continent, Prose Works 4:304. Though Arnold here lauded Italy's civil organisation, in a 1867

letter to his sister K he criticized this nation's administrative system, coupling her with England in this respect. (Letter to his sister K, December 20, 1867, Russell, Letters 1:379).

77. Schools and Universities on the Continent, Prose Works 4:304.

78. Ibid., p. 305.

79. "England and the Italian Question," Prose Works 1:95; Introd. to The Popular Education of France, Prose Works 2:29.

80. "Heinrich Heine," Prose Works 3:109.

81. Preface to Mixed Essays, Prose Works 8:370.

82. See Francine B. Malder, "Matthew Arnold and the Idea of Progress," Centennial Review 19, No. 4 (Fall 1975):239.

83. "On the Modern Element in Literature," Prose Works 1:19.

84. Ibid., pp. 23-24.

85. "A French Critic on Milton," Prose Works 8:169.

86. A French Eton, Prose Works 2:321.

87. Lionel Trilling, "On the Modern Element in Modern Literature," Varieties of Literary Experience, ed. Stanley Burnshaw (New York: New York University Press, 1962), p. 420. See also Charles R. Moyer, "The Idea of History in Thomas and Matthew Arnold," Modern Philology 67, No. 2 (November 1969):162.

88. "On Translating Homer," Prose Works 1:140. Arnold repeated these words a few years later in 1864 at the beginning of "The Function of Criticism at the Present Time," Prose Works 3:258.

89. "Preface to Burke," Prose Works 9:289.

90. Letter to his mother, May 7, 1848, Russell, Letters 1:10.

91. Letter to Arthur Hugh Clough, February 12, 1853, Lowry, Letters, p. 130.

92. "A Liverpool Address," Prose Works 10:84. See also "A Word More about America," Prose Works 10:204; Preface to Irish Essays, Prose Works 9:317.

93. It is interesting to read in a Dec. 24, 1859 letter to his sister Arnold's comments on Ernest Renan's and his own diagnoses of the problems of their respective nations. Renan "tends to inculcate MORALITY, in a high sense of the word, upon the French nation as to what they most want, while I tend to inculcate INTELLIGENCE, also in a high sense of the word, upon the English nation as what they most want; but with all respect both to morality and

intelligence, I think we are singularly at one with our ideas." (Russell, Letters 1:111). In "An Eton Boy" Arnold declared that there may be dangers in French lucidity and distinct virtues in English Puritanism: "Our French neighbours have moved faster than we; they have more lucidity, in several important respects, than we have; they have fewer illusions. but a modern French school-boy, Voltairean and emancipated, reading La Fille Elisa and Nana, making it his pastime to play tricks on his chaplain, to mock and flout him and his teaching--the production of a race of lucid school-boys of this kind is a dangerous privilege. When I lay down the memoir of Dr. Raleigh I feel that, crude and faulty as is the type of religion offered by Puritanism, narrow and false as is its conception of human life, materialistic and impossible as is its world to come, yet the seriousness, soberness, and devout energy of Puritanism are a prize once won, never to be lost; they are a possession to our race for ever." ("An Eton Boy," Prose Works 10:45).

Though Arnold remained a francophile all his life and preserved a keen interest in all aspects of French civilisation, he was by no means an uncritical observer of this nation, for he often adversely criticised things Gallic. Moreover, this was especially the case in the last decade or so of his life when he gazed increasingly askance at what he perceived to be the growing moral laxity of the French. This was the time when he believed that French society was being pervaded by the goddess Lubricity or, using her Greek name, Aselgeia. ("Numbers," Prose Works 10:155). This worship was particularly manifest in their modern plays, their lighter newspapers and novels, and their art in general. ("At the Princess's," Prose Works 10:96; "Numbers," Prose Works 10:159; "Count Leo Tolstoi," Prose Works 11:292-293). He felt that France was in the throes of a dangerous and perhaps lethal disease, and rather than clericalism it was this goddess which was her real enemy--"and if they can none of them see this themselves, it is only a sign of how far the disease has gone, and the case is so much the worse." ("Numbers," Prose Works 10:161). In his 1885 "A Comment on Christmas" he wrote that the world of Paris, had the reign of this goddess almost established; moreover, he considered that the French "seem perfectly and scornfully incredulous as to the cogency of the beatitude which pronounces blessings on the pure in heart; they would not for a moment admit that nations perish through the service of the great goddess Lubricity." Rather, all elements of the population regarded this service as being perfectly natural and reasonable. But this service, Arnold maintained, was responsible for the dissolution of the old Roman Empire and was capable of breaking up any society today. ("A Comment on Christmas," Prose Works 10:227, 235-236). Indeed, years earlier in an 1871 letter to his mother Arnold wrote that despite her great advantages and resources, among which he counted the qualities of her genius such as "lucidity, directness of intellect, and social charm," France might not be able to recover at the present time as she did after 1815. Her fall was mainly due to a lack of a sense of righteousness, a lack which had in the past had dire consequences for many nations, particularly the Graeco-Latin ones, with the

fall of Greece, Rome, and quattrocento Italy all being prominent examples. [Letter to his mother, January 31, 1871, Russell, *Letters* 2:48. However, in another letter to his mother a few months later he observed that though France at present gave little cause for satisfaction, "yet probably she is by no means, as might be expected, on the way to lose all her importance and influence in the world." (Letter to his mother, May 31, 1871, Russell, *Letters* 2:57). In "George Sand" (1877) he wrote of "that astonishing recovery which France has made since her defeat." ("George Sand," *Prose Works* 8:231)].
Scattered throughout Arnold's later writings are numerous observations on the wants and needs of France, e.g. she needed more "men with a passion for the plain virtues, and capable of inspiring this passion in others"; her "best hope for the future" was to produce more and more men of "seriousness, conscience, and sense of duty," as well as of QUALITÉS CHARMANTES; while the French peasant was deemed to be in a satisfactory state, the educated classes required "simpler, more serious views of life; a knowledge how great a part CONDUCT fills in it." (Letter to M. Fontanès, June 29, 1883, Russell, *Letters* 2:214; "A French Worthy," *Prose Works* 10:92-93; "George Sand," *Prose Works* 8:234). In April 1874 Arnold wrote to M. Fontanès complaining that "Serious politics are really not to the taste of your people; what they like is the GAME of politics with its intrigues and sterile agitations, and no simple solution would give them any pleasure."(Russell, *Letters* 2:115). Elsewhere he pointed to the absence of high seriousness, τὸ σπουδαῖον of the Greeks, VIRTUS VERUSQUE LABOR of Virgil, which "keeps France back from perfection." ("Renan's 'La Réforme Intellectuelle,'" *Prose Works* 7:48). Moreover, the French had never schooled themselves in the formation of the right moral sentiments, nor indeed did they have much conception of such a schooling. ("A French Elijah," *Prose Works* 7:11). As we read in a letter to his mother on September 14, 1870: "One reads and hears much about the war; I have this morning read French, German, Italian and English newspapers. I think the seige of Paris contains possible difficulty and disaster for the Germans, but the French provoke one by their incorrigibility, by their persisting in regarding themselves and Paris as something to which another measure is to be meted than is meted to the rest of the world, and by their utter failure to see that in their own fatal want of morality and seriousness is the course (cause ?) of all their disasters." [*The A.K. Davis-Matthew Arnold Collection*, Univ. of Virginia Library, No. 4885, Box 18 (with the help of Ms. Kirsch's transcript)]. In "Equality" (1878) Arnold wrote that the French had never paid the same attention to the power of conduct as they had to the power of social life and manners. ("Equality," *Prose Works* 8:293). Moreover, he was quite assured that the reason for the French lack of morality, of a sense of righteousness and the power of conduct was because of the failure of the Reformation, a great moral movement in their country. He agreed with Michelet who declared that the Reformation failed because France was "éloignée de réforme morale," "la France ne voulait pas de réforme morale." ("A French Elijah," *Prose Works* 7:11; "Equality," *Prose Works*

8:292; "Numbers," Prose Works 10:156; "Renan's 'La Reforme Intellectuelle,'" Prose Works 7:44; also Letter to M. Fontanès, June 29, 1883, Russell Letters 2:214-215).
Thus, Arnold was clearly ambivalent towards the French. However, even when in his 1882 lecture "Numbers" he inveighed against what he considered the French moral declension, he uttered what was in effect an apologia for his long indebtedness to and his sincere concern and affection for the French nation: "To France I have always felt myself powerfully drawn. People in England often accuse me of liking France and things French far too well. At all events I have paid special regard to them, and am always glad to confess how much I owe to them. M. Sainte-Beuve wrote to me in the last years of his life: 'You have passed through our life and literature by a deep inner line, which confers initiation, and which you will never lose.' VOUS AVEZ TRAVERSÉ NOTRE VIE ET NOTRE LITTÉRATURE PAR UNE LIGNE INTÉRIEURE, PROFONDE, QUI FAIT LES INITIÉS, ET QUE VOUS NE PERDREZ JAMAIS. I wish I could think that this friendly testimony of that accomplished and charming man, one of my chief benefactors, were fully deserved. But I have pride and pleasure in quoting it; and I quote it to bear me out in saying, that whatever opinion I may express about France, I have at least been a not inattentive observer of that great country, and anything but a hostile one." ("Numbers," Prose Works 10:154). At any rate, though he recognized that France and her people had obvious faults, he also knew that in certain respects they were clearly superior to their English counterparts and that his own country could stand to benefit greatly by emulating some of the French attributes and practices, especially the institution of a State-controlled secondary educational system.

94. "A Liverpool Address," Prose Works 10:85.

95. Four years earlier, Arnold in "'Porro Unum Est Necessarium'" (1878) had written that "the French middle class above all, pique themselves on their logic and lucidity. The French mind craves it; Voltaire, the French Luther of the eighteenth century was a splendid professor and propagator of it." ("'Porro Unum Est Necessarium,'" Prose Works 8:363).

96. "A Liverpool Address," Prose Works 10:87.

97. Ibid., pp. 87-88.

98. "Falkland," Prose Works 8:206-207.

99. "A Speech at Westminster," Prose Works 7:87.

100. "A Word More about America," Prose Works 10:203, 212-213, 215.

101. "From Easter to August," Prose Works 11:264.

102. See for example: "The Literary Influence of Academies," Prose Works 3:237; On The Study of Celtic Literature, Prose Works 3:341; "Irish Catholicism and British Liberalism," Prose Works

8:293; "The French Play in London," Prose Works 9:79.

103. "Disestablishment in Wales," Prose Works 11:335.

104. The Popular Education of France, Prose Works 2:63.

105. "Heinrich Heine," Prose Works 3:112-113.

106. Ibid., p. 119. See also God and the Bible, Prose Works 7:280-281.

107. "Heinrich Heine," Prose Works 3:113; also "Civilisation in the United States," Prose Works 11:363.

108. "The Literary Influence of Academies," Prose Works 3:237 et seq..

109. Ibid., p. 237.

110. "Joubert," Prose Works 3:193.

111. Letter to Arthur Hugh Clough, March 6, 1848, Lowry, Letters, pp. 72-73.

112. Letter to his sister K (Jane Martha), Friday, March 10, 1848, Russell, Letters 1:5-6.

113. "England and the Italian Question," Prose Works 1:78-79.

114. The Popular Education of France, Prose Works 2:153.

115. See Letter to Arthur Hugh Clough, August 11, 1859, Lowry, Letters, p. 150; also The Popular Education of France, Prose Works 2:159.

116. "Equality," Prose Works 8:288.

117. On the Study of Celtic Literature, Prose Works 3:381.

118. Letter to his mother, July 10, 1866, The A.K. Davis-Matthew Arnold Collection, Univ. of Virginia Library, No. 4885, Box 15 (Ms. Kirsch's transcript).

119. Preface to 1st ed. of Literature and Dogma, Prose Works 6:157.

120. "The Literary Influence of Academies," Prose Works 3:243. See also "The Function of Criticism at the Present Time," Prose Works 3:278.

121. "Heinrich Heine," Prose Works 3:114. However, in the preface to the first edition of Literature and Dogma (1873) Arnold wrote: "In the German mind, as in the German language, there does seem to be something SPLAY, something blunt-edged, unhandy and infelicitous,--some positive want of straightforward, sure perception which tends to balance the great superiority of the Germans in special knowledge, and in the disposition to deal

impartially with knowledge. For impartial they are, as well as learned; and this is a signal merit....Still, in quickness, and sense of perception,--in tact,--they do seem to fall somewhat short." (Preface to the first edition of Literature and Dogma, Prose Works 6:159). Earlier in On the Study of Celtic Literature (1866) he declared: "Only the German race, with its want of quick instinctive tact, of delicate, sure perception, could have invented the hymn as the Germans and we have it." (On the Study of Celtic Literature, Prose Works 3:368).

122. "An Unregarded Irish Grievance," Prose Works 9:309.

123. Schools and Universities on the Continent, Prose Works 4:314.

124. Conclusion to Culture and Anarchy, Cornhill edition (1868) Prose Works 5:527.

125. A French Eton, Prose Works 2:294.

126. "An Unregarded Irish Grievance," Prose Works 9:304, 310.

127. See A French Eton, Prose Works 2:295.

128. Schools and Universities on the Continent, Prose Works 4:147.

129. Ibid., p. 150.

130. Ibid., p. 288.

131. A French Eton, Prose Works 2:276.

132. Lionel Trilling, Matthew Arnold, p. 179.

133. Letter to his mother, February 11, 1864, Russell, Letters 1:227.

134. Introd. to The Popular Education of France, Prose Works 2:19; also pp. 4 et seq.; Culture and Anarchy, Prose Works 5:117-118.

135. "'Ecce, Convertimur ad Gentes,'" Prose Works 9:2.

136. A French Eton, Prose Works 2:305.

137. Introd. to The Popular Education of France, Prose Works 2:19-20.

138. A French Eton, Prose Works 2:306.

139. Introd. to The Popular Education of France, Prose Works 2:21.

140. "Roman Catholics and the State," Prose Works 7:134.

141. The Popular Education of France, Prose Works 2:37.

142. A French Eton, Prose Works 2:299. For the catchword against State-meddling see "The Mansion-House Meeting," letter to the

Editor of the Pall Mall Gazette, Jan. 17, 1866, Prose Works 4:9.

143. "'Ecce, Convertimur ad Gentes,'" Prose Works 9:2.

144. "German Letters on English Education," Prose Works 8:210.

145. Ibid., pp. 211, 209.

146. Preface to Schools and Universities on the Continent, Prose Works 4:30.

147. Ibid., p. 30.

148. "'Ecce, Convertimur ad Gentes,'" Prose Works 9:2.

149. Ibid., pp. 2-3.

150. A French Eton, Prose Works 2:301. Even while he was in composing A French Eton (1864) Arnold knew well, because of the prevailing antagonism to the State, that he would have to be very careful about how he worded his proposals. Writing to Lady de Rothschild about January 1864, he observed: "I am going to be hard at work this next week at the second part of my 'French Eton'; an anxious business, because I want to recommend State-intervention in secondary instruction, without giving such offence and calling forth such yells of outcry as to do more harm than good." [Letter to Lady de Rothschild, Sunday (c.Jan. 1864), The A.K. Davis-Matthew Arnold Collection, Univ. of Virginia Library, No. 4885, Box 14, (Ms. Kirsch's transcript)].

151. "Education and the State (1)," letter to the Editor of the Pall Mall Gazette, Prose Works 4:4. See also "The Mansion House Meeting," letter to the Editor of the Pall Mall Gazette, Prose Works 4:11. Sometimes Arnold was optimistic regarding the English acceptance of State-action. For example, while he was deeply involved in composing his Taunton report he wrote to his mother on August 11, 1866: "However the English world is visibly beginning to move my way, in the whole question of State-action; so it is worth keeping at work, and doing all one can to prevent checks & stoppages." [Letter to his mother, August 11, 1866, The A.K. Davis-Matthew Arnold Collection, Univ. of Virginia Library, No. 4885, Box 15 (Ms. Kirsch's transcript)].

152. "An Unregarded Irish Grievance," Prose Works 9:309.

153. The Dissenters' case was put succinctly by Arnold in "Schools in the Reign of Queen Victoria": they "argued that the school was a religious institution, that the State could not touch religion without profaning it, and that with the school, therefore, the State should have nothing to do." ("Schools in the Reign of Queen Victoria," Prose Works 11:222).

154. "An Unregarded Irish Grievance," Prose Works 9:306.

CHAPTER FOUR

ARNOLD ON THE INFERIOR CIVILISATION OF THE ENGLISH MIDDLE CLASSES

A) "the civilisation of her middle class is England's capital pressing want"

In February 1866 Arnold, only a few months after returning from abroad and his work there for the Taunton Commission, published "My Countrymen" in the Cornhill. This article, written at a time when debate and agitation regarding the proposed Reform Bill were rife and England's future to many now increasingly uncertain, had as its chief theme the role of England in the modern world and the perception of this role by other nations. Arnold, drawing on his lengthy travels abroad during the previous year, 1865, had as his aim "to see ourselves as others see us" and to ascertain how such foreign opinion regarding England's condition would square with his own rather critical ones.[1] His main conclusion was that foreign nations tended, at best, to treat England in a cavalier, not very serious manner and, at worst, with active dislike and contempt. At any rate, England was perceived as no longer being a very strong power but, rather, to have declined quite dramatically since the glory days of 1815, while, at the same time, Continental nations had risen in strength and prestige.

Moreover, much of the blame for the unsatisfactory condition of England on the world's stage was laid at the feet of the newly triumphant middle class. As Arnold had imaginary foreign critics declare:

> You are losing the instinct which tells people how the world is going; you are beginning to make mistakes; you are falling out of the first rank.

> The era of aristocracies is over; nations must now stand or fall by the intelligence of their middle class and their people. The people with you is still an embryo; no one can yet quite say what it will come to. You lean, therefore, with your whole weight upon the intelligence of your middle class. And intelligence, in the true sense of the word, your middle class has absolutely none.[2]

Arnold professed himself aghast at these criticisms and in this essay, in his adopted role of devil's advocate, he countered by quoting from a speech of Robert Lowe against the extension of Reform which contained an encomium of the virtues of middle class legislation over the past thirty-five years. However, Arnold represented his imaginary critics as not being particularly convinced by Lowe's speech but as continuing their onslaught on middle class society. While acknowledging that middle class keenness for industry and business had made them wealthy and had thus nourished the body, they maintained that the care of their intelligence and soul had been neglected by this class. That the middle class had not fostered the things of the mind was evident from the appalling state of their schools which were much worse than their counterparts on the Continent. Nor had they looked to the care of the soul, as their religion was "narrow, unintelligent, repulsive....the lowest form of intelligent life which one can imagine as saving." Nor were their pastimes, particularly their literature, very congenial. Indeed, asked these foreign critics rhetorically, could one imagine a life "more hideous, more dismal, more unenviable?" It certainly bore no comparison to the liberalising and civilising life of the foreign middle classes which one might find on the Rhine, at Lausanne, or at Zurich. Accordingly, as Arnold had these fictional Continental critics declare, the English middle class

> may be masters of the modern time with you, but

> they are not solving its problem. They cannot see the way the world is going, and the future does not belong to them. Talk of the present state of development and civilisation of England, meaning England as they represent it to us! Why, the capital, pressing danger of England, is the barbarism of her middle class; the civilisation of her middle class is England's capital, pressing want.[3]

Certainly, the foreigners continued, England's middle class Parliament had brought about a number of beneficial reforms over the previous third of a century, but on the Continent the French Revolution and its effects had produced much more. Questions such as the Irish Church Establishment or the Irish land-question would not have been problems in either France or Germany. Nor would these countries have tolerated the unsatisfactory nature of the schools in England for both the middle and the working classes--England's plentiful endowments and foundations would have been put to much better use abroad, just as France and Germany had shown by the use they made of their own. In addition, though the English talked of municipal reform it was not likely that countries such as France, Germany, Switzerland, Italy, which had shown intelligence and care in adapting their municipalities to the needs of a modern society, would have tolerated the unsatisfactory nature of London or the provincial towns. Furthermore, continued these imaginary assailants,

> Your middle-class man thinks it the highest pitch of development and civilisation when his letters are carried twelve times a day from Islington to Camberwell, and from Camberwell to Islington, and if railway-trains run to and fro between them every quarter of an hour. He thinks it is nothing that the trains only carry him from an illiberal, dismal life at Islington to an illiberal, dismal life at Camberwell; and the letters only tell him that such is the life there. [4]

But the life of the middle class on the Continent was very different;

Arnold had his foreign critics adduce the example of a Swiss burgher at Berne or Geneva whose life compared very favourably with his counterpart in England.[5] "My Countrymen" continued in like vein with other criticisms of English, and particularly middle class, society being set forth by these imaginary foreigners and with Arnold weakly attempting to defend his country from this verbal assault.

Of course, all this criticism placed in the mouths of foreigners in this 1866 essay constituted Arnold's own views of his country's problems, his use of fictional critics being a stylistic device. Moreover, such views recur again and again in his writings and, as we shall see, he certainly did not wait until 1866 to enunciate his caustic opinions of England's middle class society. For he consistently held throughout his life that this class, despite what he considered to be their many good qualities and traits and their major role in effecting England's great material and imperial progress, was the source of numerous problems and inadequacies pervading English society and was the segment of the population which was most in need of transformation if England were to make satisfactory progress on the world stage. We turn now to an examination of more of his criticisms respecting this class and particularly his opinions of their Philistinism, their Hebraism, their Dissent, their participation in the "religion of inequality," and their association with the Liberal Party.

B) Philistinism of the Middle Class

Arnold's 1863 article "Heinrich Heine" is notable for containing what was one of his earliest discussions of the notion of Philistinism, a word which he was soon to assign so forcefully and frequently to the middle class that it became almost a synonym to many of his readers, whether they agreed with his attribution or not, to this class. "Philistine," Arnold declared,

> must have originally meant, in the mind of those who invented the nickname, a strong, dogged, unenlightened opponent of the chosen people, of the children of the light. The party of change, the would-be remodellers of the old traditional European order, the invokers of reason against custom, the representatives of the modern spirit in every sphere where it is applicable, regarded themselves, with the robust self-confidence natural to reformers, as a chosen people, as children of the light. They regarded their adversaries as humdrum people, slaves to routine, enemies to light; stupid and oppressive, but at the same time very strong.[6]

It was with such a Philistine nature that Arnold invariably viewed the English middle class to be imbued, a nature which was hindering England's striving for modernity and progress. In fact, as he wrote in the Introduction to the published version of On the Study of Celtic Literature (1866) he was steadfast in his conviction that it was the bane of English society:

> We in England have come to that point when the continued advance and greatness of our nation is threatened by one cause, and one cause above all. Far more than by the helplessness of an aristocracy whose day is fast coming to an end, far more than by the rawness of a lower class whose day is only just beginning, we are imperilled by what I call the 'Philistinism' of our middle class. On the side of beauty and taste, vulgarity; on the side of morals and feeling, coarseness; on the side of mind and spirit, unintelligence,--this is Philistinism.[7]

It was this Philistine nature of the middle class which had to be transformed and perfected by being brought to culture and light, the main agency for so doing, in Arnold's view, being State education. Moreover, he himself frequently declared that he would do all in his power to help this movement though he was rarely confident that the task would be easy. In a letter to his sister K (Jane Martha) in November 1863, five months after the above words in "Heinrich Heine," he wrote that he would do what he could to "charm the wild beast of Philistinism," but that he ran the risk of being torn in pieces in the process and, even if successful in his efforts at conversion, he might still end his days in a ditch or a workhouse.[8] But he was convinced that if this Philistinism of the middle class persisted, especially as this class was now the dominant one in society, England's outlook would be bleak.

The word Philistinism as used by Arnold was a blanket term covering a very broad range of defective traits. As we have seen in the previous chapter he was little impressed by the mental condition of his compatriots when contrasted with that of the Germans and French. But it was the intellectual state of the English middle class which he found particularly wanting and which he felt most justified the label of Philistinism. Moreover, this was an especially grievous fault as it was this class which was so prominent in English political affairs--"the great Philistine middle class, the master-force in our politics"; they in fact were the rulers of the country.[9] Of course, Arnold by no means always used the term Philistinism when he criticised the middle class. But whether he actually used it or not he was consistent throughout his life in his strictures and condemnations of this most important grouping in English society and in his emphasis that the various inadequacies which might be subsumed under the general heading of Philistinism constituted the main reason for keeping this class and consequently England herself in an inferior state relative to certain Continental neighbours.

Writing to his sister K (Jane Martha) in February 1856 he revealed that he was not particularly sanguine about the inevitable ascendancy of the middle class whose mental condition left much to be desired: "the English aristocratic system, splendid fruits as it has undoubtedly borne, must go. I say it does not rejoice me to think this, because what a middle class and people we have in England! of whom Saint Simon says truly: 'Sur tous les chantiers de l'Angleterre il n'existe pas une seule grande idée.'"[10] Three and a half years later, he was especially assertive in his condemnation of this class, writing to his sister Fan of "the immense vulgar-mindedness, and, so far, real inferiority of the English middle class."[11] But, as he revealed in the Introduction to The Popular Education of France (1861), a prime fault of this class was its ignorance of having any weakness or inferiority; the members were proud of their achievements and considered the future to be theirs. No one, he declared, held them in higher esteem than himself and that was why he would indicate their faults which, if not eliminated, might hinder their future well-being: "They want culture and dignity; they want ideas. Aristocracy has culture and dignity; democracy has readiness for new ideas, and ardour for what ideas it possesses. Of these, our middle class has the last only: ardour for the ideas it already possesses."[12] While acknowledging that the middle classes were indeed possessed of fine qualities, their want of a high reason, a fine culture, and ideas was especially to be lamented since "in modern epochs the part of a high reason, of ideas, acquires constantly increasing importance in the conduct of the world's affairs."[13] In a letter to Harriet Martineau, dated July 24, 1860 (before his contribution to the Newcastle Commission was published as The Popular Education of France), Arnold stressed the pressing need in England, especially among the Nonconformists, of high reason and intelligence:

> I must try, if I publish my Report, to make this clear; and to make clear, also, my motive for laying so much stress on reason, and intelligence. The Nonconformists, it seems to me, have in their day done good service by maintaining the cause of individual freedom and independence: but at the present day, in England, freedom and independence are pretty well secured, and our great want is intelligence, which Nonconformity rather obstructs than advances. In our Indian policy, in our foreign policy, in our social policy--in the dealing, with all our greatest interests--it is not, it seems to me, freedom, not energy, not even honesty that is at the present day wanting in England, but intelligence--that "haute raison" which alone can safely deal with interests so complicated and of such Magnitude as ours.[14]

That is why, he strenuously asserted in the Introduction to The Popular Education of France (1861), it was so important for the middle classes, whose role in the nation's affairs over the next half century would "probably give a decisive turn to its history," to turn to State-run education. This was the agency which would most effectively ensure their transformation. Otherwise, in their rule over the nation they would only vulgarise it or

> AMERICANISE it.[15] They will rule it by their energy, but they will deteriorate it by their low

> ideals and want of culture. In the decline of the aristocratical element, which in some sort supplied an ideal to ennoble the spirit of the nation and to keep it together, there will be no other element present to perform this service. It is of itself a serious calamity for a nation that its tone of feeling and grandeur of spirit should be lowered or dulled. But the calamity appears far more serious still when we consider that the middle classes, remaining as they are now, with their narrow, harsh, unintelligent, and unattractive spirit and culture, will almost certainly fail to mould or assimilate the masses below them, whose sympathies are at the present moment actually wider and more liberal than theirs. They arrive, these masses, eager to enter into possession of the world, to gain a more vivid sense of their own life and activity. In this their irrepressible development, their natural educators and initiators are those immediately above them, the middle classes. If these classes cannot win their sympathy or give them their direction, society is in danger of falling into anarchy.[16]

Thus the inadequacies of the middle class, blatant in Arnold's eyes, were to be remedied and the whole class itself to be transformed both for its own sake and for that of the great populace below it. Similarly, A French Eton (1864) contained many of Arnold's perceptions of the shortcomings of the middle class among whose members, he held, the typical Englishman was to be found.[17] A major fault of such an individual was his antipathy to new ideas, as well as his lack of enthusiasm over universal progress. On the contrary, he firmly believed in discipline, order, and the status quo. Whereas the multitude and the gifted and well educated few were imbued with a love of ideals, the one induced by poverty and hope, the other by culture and genius, the middle class possessed of neither poverty nor culture had "little turn for ideals: it [was] self-satisfied."[18] Indeed, self-satisfaction, he considered, was one of the main faults pervading the middle class, though, as we read in a 1864 letter to his younger brother Thomas where this defect was stressed, he acknowledged that some improvement was at hand:

> The only way to accomplish what we want is to make the middle class eager and earnest about it, not suspiciously looking on merely. Sometimes I think this may be accomplished and then I meet a Wesleyan minister of 40 or 50, whose under-culture, self-satisfaction, representative character, and robust influence, drive me to despair. But he must die in his sins, and we must look to the young ones, who have been born in a somewhat changed and better atmosphere. Self-dissatisfaction is the lesson to teach our English middle class--and I really think they shew signs of beginning to learn it.[19]

While Arnold did not employ the term Philistinism in his critical comments on the middle class in *The Popular Education of France* (1861) nor in *A French Eton* (1864), his views on this class's faults obviously come under this general heading. For their lack of culture, dignity, ideas, high reason, their low ideals, their narrow, harsh, unintelligent and unattractive spirit, their self-satisfaction, their acceptance of the status quo, their neglect of what Arnold held to be real progress, and so on, were nothing other than Philistinism. He did, however, in his 1866 *On the Study of Celtic Literature* speak of "the Philistinism of our Saxon nature" which made itself felt in conversations about "the sewage question, and the glories of our local self-government, and the mysterious perfections of the Metropolitan Board of Works."[20] But it was a very important work of the late 1860s where he was particularly lavish in his usage of the epithet. In fact, it was his study where the identification of the middle class with the notion of Philistinism was most clearly delineated: "The whole middle class have a conception of things,--a conception which makes us call them Philistines."[21] This was *Culture and Anarchy*, published in book form in January 1869 after having appeared previously as articles in journals and periodicals. In this, his prose work which is probably the best known today, Arnold despite his often jocular and playful tone [22] clearly revealed his fears about the way English society was tending and about what he felt to be the inadequacy of the different classes, as they were then constituted, to play satisfactory roles in the government of this society. It was a long work and the barbs of his criticisms found targets in manifold sectors of English life with the middle class being especially singled out.

One of the main shortcomings of the members of this class, according to Arnold, was their intellectual inadequacy, their hostility to ideas, light, culture. That is why he bestowed on them

> the designation of Philistines; the Philistine being, as is well known, the enemy of the children of light or servants of the idea....For PHILISTINE gives the notion of something particularly stiff-necked and perverse in the resistance to light and its children; and therein it specially suits our middle class, who not only do not pursue sweetness and light, but who even prefer to them that sort of machinery of business, chapels, tea-meetings, and addresses from Mr. Murphy, which makes up the dismal and illiberal life on which I have so often touched.[23]

It was these Philistines who especially displayed the attitude, anathema to Arnold himself and one which he dismissed as mere "machinery," that wealth was a valuable end in itself and that England's greatness was mainly due to her riches. In the face of such an attitude Arnold imagined the "Culture" of the title remarking: "'Consider these people, then, their way of life, their habits, their manners, the very tones of their voice; look at them attentively; observe the literature they read, the things which give them pleasure, the words which come out of their mouths, the thoughts which make the furniture of their minds; would any amount of wealth be worth having with the condition that one was to become just like these people by having it?'"[24] Indeed, Arnold was always very eager to refute the notion, and one which he consistently associated with the Philistine middle class, that civilisation and progress were synonymous with material goods. For example, in "The Incompatibles" (1881) we read:

> Business is civilisation, think many of us; it creates and implies it. The general diffusion of material well-being is civilisation, thought Mr. Cobden, as that eminent man's biographer has just informed us; it creates and implies it. Not always. And for fear we should forget what business and what material well-being have to create, before they do really imply civilisation, let us, at the risk of being thought tiresome, repeat here what we have said often of old. Business and material well-being are signs of expansion and parts of it; but civilisation, that great and complex force, includes much more than even that power of expansion of which they are parts. It includes also the power of conduct, the power of intellect and knowledge, the power of beauty, the power of social life and manners. To the building up of human life all these powers belong. If business is civilisation, then business must manage to evolve all these powers; if a widely-spread material well-being is civilisation, then that well-being must manage to evolve all of them. It is written: MAN DOTH NOT LIVE BY BREAD ALONE.[25]

Likewise, in "Civilisation in the United States" (1888) Arnold wrote: "I believe neither that happiness consists, merely or mainly, in being plentifully supplied with the comforts and conveniences of life, nor that civilisation consists in being so supplied."[26] Accordingly, what these middle class Philistines, he insisted in Culture and Anarchy (1869), were most in need of was not an increase in material wealth but, rather, more culture. It would be through the acquisition of culture that they would be transformed and improved, and helped develop that finely tempered nature of harmonious perfection which would partake of, and here he borrowed from Swift's "Battle of the Books," SWEETNESS AND LIGHT.[27] However, in England, Arnold argued, the middle classes, in many respects very impoverished apart from the possession of material wealth, were in no position to wield the authority which was suggested by culture. He was here thinking of the right reason emanating from the possession of sweetness and light which looked to his notion of the State as being the main authority in society. As usual, he was contemptuous of middle class achievements over the past few decades, sneering at their beloved industrialism, their Nonconformity, their aversion to State intervention, and such causes, among many others, as voluntaryism in education and the freedom to marry one's deceased wife's sister. He could by no means advocate that this Philistine class, any more than the Populace, that is the working class, or the Barbarians, that is the aristocracy, should constitute the authority which would be identified with the administration and legislation of State power. For he was convinced that the faults of the Philistines, particularly their inadequate mental state were

> obviously at variance with our definition of culture, or the pursuit of light and perfection, which made light and perfection consist, not in resting and being, but in growing and becoming, in a perpetual advance in beauty and wisdom. So the middle class is by its essence, as one may say, by its incomparable self-satisfaction decisively expressed through its beautiful and virtuous mean, self-excluded from wielding an authority of which light is to be the very soul.[28]

During the second half of the 1860s, while Culture and Anarchy was appearing in article form in journals and periodicals, Arnold was also publishing in the Pall Mall Gazette Friendship's Garland, a series of fictional letters between himself and an imaginary Prussian friend Arminius Von Thunder-ten-Tronckh. The main purpose of these letters was to focus on the generally poor state of many aspects of English society vis-a-vis certain foreign societies and the abysmally low regard in which England had come to be held by foreign nations. As was his wont, Arnold adopted the stylistic device of taking upon himself the part of apologist for England, while the adverse criticism was expressed through the mouth of Arminius. Though the whole surface tone of this literary exercise was generally jocular, with irony and raillery, just as in Culture and Anarchy, often present, the underlying motive of stressing the very many inadequacies of contemporary England compared with other Continental nations was never far distant. In addition, Arnold was especially keen to focus on the unsatisfactory nature of the middle classes which he portrayed as bearing much of the blame for the low state to which England had sunk in the eyes of many foreigners. Though the term Philistinism was not used quite as frequently as in Culture and Anarchy, very many of the faults attributed by Arnold to the middle class in Friendship's Garland could be grouped under this epithet. This may be illustrated by a few examples from the letters.

The main point of Letter I (1866) was to present Arminius's stress on the importance of securing the victory of GEIST, or intelligence over UNGEIST, and his praise of its victory in France where it was manifested in the triumph of democracy. GEIST, he declared, was also successful in North Germany where, because of the people's love of knowledge, the lower and middle classes were the best educated in the world. But in England there was little GEIST, for, as he asserted, "Your common people is barbarous; in your middle class 'Ungeist' is rampant; and as for your aristocracy, you know 'Geist' is forbidden by nature to flourish in an aristocracy."[29] Whereas GEIST was certainly secure among the Germans the English lived "in a country where at present the idea of clap-trap governs every department of human activity."[30] Arminius continued his eulogy on the virtues of GEIST, coupling it with contempt for England's middle class in Letter II where he argued that the GEIST accountable for French democracy had made that nation in a certain measure responsible for half of the beneficial reforms in Europe. French democracy had had a great influence in countries other than France and it would continue as a power in Europe until modern society was finally in place. For, asserted Arminius, French democracy believed in GEIST, and did not consider that people could "do without 'Geist' by dint of holding monster meetings, and having their STAR and TELEGRAPH every morning, and paying no Church-rates, and marrying their deceased wife's sister." But this was exactly what the "narrow and vulgar middle class" in England considered.[31]

Letter IX of Friendship's Garland (1870), in which Arminius was represented as departing from England to take part in the Franco-German War which broke out in 1870, offered another occasion for stressing how little England's influence now counted among other major European powers. There was less jesting here in Arminius's arguments and Arnold was clearly very eager to drive home some important points with respect to England's inferiority on the Continental stage and to the responsibility of her middle class for causing it. For, as Arminius argued, the strength of a Government's declarations depended on the power which controlled the Government and in England, he asserted decisively, this power was the Philistines: "Simply and solely the Philistines, my dear friend, take my word for it!"[32] England, unlike France and Germany, had the problem that she was not really a nation. France was one nation because of her military spirit and because of the democracy stemming from 1789, while Germany was one through her idea of union and of the education of her whole population through culture. But England was composed of three quite distinct portions, aristocracy, middle class, and lower class. However, only the middle class or Philistines ruled. Moreover, their influence in Europe, according to Arminius, was now contemptible: "and how should the world know, or much care, what your middle class mean? for they do not know it themselves."[33] These Philistines had no real foundation as had the aristocracy at the beginning of the nineteenth century, for their vaunted industrial development and liberty in effect connoted nothing other than getting rich and being left free to do as one liked. These constituted no real basis for ruling nor did they render the middle class more capable of wielding influence among foreign nations. Furthermore, a prime fault of this middle class was their want of any great and serious purpose or end; this accounted for their lack of magnanimity and the absence of any steadfastness and influence in great affairs. They did not yet realise, declared Arminius, that to be successful in great affairs depended on submitting to the complete control of the State as in Prussia.[34] He ended this letter by exhorting the

> Philistine middle class, which is now England, to get, as I say, "Geist"; to search and not rest till

> it sees things more as they really are, and how little of a power over things as they really are is its money-making, or its unrestricted independence, or its newspaper publicity, or its Dissent, or any of the things with which it is now most taken; and how its newspapers deceive it when they tell it night and day that, being what it is, and having the object it has, it commands the envy and deference of the world, and is on the sure road to greatness and happiness, if indeed it be not already arrived there. My dear friend, I have told you our German programme,--THE ELEVATION OF A WHOLE PEOPLE THROUGH CULTURE. That need not be your English programme, but surely you may have some better programme than this your present one,--THE BEATIFICATION OF A WHOLE PEOPLE THROUGH CLAP-TRAP.[35]

Arminius' last letter, Letter X (1870), written from the German camp before Paris, continued his diatribe on the inadequacies of the "ignorant and impracticable" English Philistine and stressed the necessity of improving him and furnishing him with new ideas. For in his present unsatisfactory state, Arminius held, he was incapable of governing and could only bring mortification upon his nation. But how best this transformation was to be effected Arminius himself acknowledged he was at a loss to know. He was sure, however, that it would take time. He also seemed to intimate that some Government action might be employed in bringing about the improvement: "Your Government might, no doubt, do something to speed the improvement, if it cared a little more, in serving the Philistines, for what might do them good, and a little less for what might please them; but perhaps this is too much to expect from your Government."[36] Of course, Arnold himself was convinced that the best way to transform and improve the Philistine middle class was through Government action, the main vehicle to be employed being a system of public secondary schools modelled to a greater or lesser degree upon analogous systems on the Continent.

However, Philistinism, in Arnold's opinion, was not exclusive to the English. Indeed, he often criticized the German people, particularly those of the middle class, in language reminiscent of that used to castigate the Philistinism of the middle class English. For example, Germans came in for stern criticism at the time he was touring their country during his work for the Taunton Commission. In a letter to his mother from Berlin dated July 5, 1865, he described Germany as "the most BOURGEOIS of nations; that is exactly the definition of them, and they have all the merits and defects which this definition implies."[37] A little over two months later in a letter from Dresden to Wyndham Slade he made the following observations:

> Now I am here I must see everything in this direction, for I shall never come to Germany again, partly because all time passed in touring anywhere in Western Europe, except Italy, seems to me, with my present lights, time misspent, partly because the Germans, with their hideousness and commonness, are no relief to one's spirit, but rather depress it. Never surely was there seen a people of so many millions so unattractive. [38]

Two and a half weeks later in a letter to W.E. Forster from Berne, he contended that Germany suffered from her absence of a great upper class close to the aristocracy in education and tastes such as was the strength of England, for "the whole middle class hates refinement and disbelieves in it; this makes North Germany, where the middle class has it, socially though not governmentally, all its own way, so intensely unattractive and disagreeable."[39] Writing to his mother on August 18, 1871 from Bell'Alp, Switzerland, he dismissed the Germans with short shrift as an "uninteresting people of the middle class type."[40] Thus, it is manifest that he recognised a distinct element of Philistinism in Germany also. But he stressed in On The Study of Celtic Literature (1866) that the Philistinism of the Germans was marked by signal differences from that of the English, and this was due to certain important variations in the characteristics of the two races. While the English spirit was characterised by "energy with honesty," that of the Germans was distinguished by "steadiness with honesty." He readily admitted that this steadiness with honesty could lead to a great defect, namely the German humdrum, commonness, the ignoble, the plain and ugly, in short, DAS GEMEINE, DIE GEMEINHEIT, a defect evident to any traveller to Northern Germany where drabness, commonness, lack of beauty were pervasive. Nevertheless, he considered that a nation characterised by this steadiness with honesty had the excellence of "freedom from whim, flightiness, perverseness; patient fidelity to Nature,--in a word, SCIENCE,--leading it at last, though slowly, and not by the most brilliant road, out of the bondage of the humdrum and common, into the better life." Such steadiness with honesty among the Germans had led to their industry, patience, well-doing, the notion of science governing human activity and from this aspect of her genius, in addition to the great results she had also achieved, Germany was "destined, we may depend upon it, however her pedantry, her slowness, her fumbling, her ineffectiveness, her bad government, may at times make us cry out, to an immense development."[41] Accordingly, though Arnold agreed that some good was to be found in English Philistinism he held that the German variety would probably produce greater benefits for that country. Moreover, not only was he firmly convinced that science, taken in its general sense, had a well-secured home in Germany he was also assured, as he pointed out in Schools and Universities on the Continent (1868), that ~~in~~ that country also, culture, his great wish for England, was likewise highly esteemed:

> What I admire in Germany is, that while there too industrialism, that great modern power, is making at Berlin, and Leipzig, and Elberfeld, the most successful and rapid progress, the idea of culture, culture of the only true sort, is in Germany a living power also. Petty towns have a university whose teaching is famous through Europe; and the King of Prussia and Count Bismarck resist the loss of a great SAVANT from Prussia, as they would resist a political check. If true culture ever becomes at last a civilising power in the world, and is not overlaid by fanaticism, by industrialism, or by frivolous pleasure-seeking, it will be to the faith and zeal of this homely and much ridiculed German people, that the great result will be mainly owing.[42]

Accordingly, though Arnold clearly did not like the German people very much [43] and though he acknowledged that Philistinism was indeed an attribute of the German character, he believed that the true science and culture which he so earnestly wished to be fostered among the English middle classes would have a more secure future in Germany. In fact, again and again in his writings he set forth the German achievements in the spheres of art, literature, education, natural and applied science, culture, and so on as the model to be emulated by his own compatriots, especially those of the Philistine middle class.

Arnold's notion of Philistinism was most fully developed and elaborated during the 1860s; however he continued to utilise this notion and particularly his attribution of it to the English middle classes right up to his death in 1888. It is true that during much of the 1870s when he was particularly concerned with religious writings Arnold in criticising the middle classes stressed their inadequacies in the sphere of religion, especially their Nonconformity. However, when we turn to his writings of a more social, political, and educational nature which commenced again in full spate towards the end of the 1870s, it is evident that his antipathy to the general character, behaviour, influence, and intellectual condition of "That wonderful creature, the British Philistine" was just as strong then as it had been a decade earlier.[44] This period also saw Arnold turn more and more to the question of Ireland and the participation in it of the Philistine class, his general thesis being that Philistinism in all its various manifestations had been the bane of the Irish situation. We read in a December 1877 letter to his sister Fan: "One of the many blessings, my dear Fan, which we owe to Puritanism is this impracticable condition of Ireland."[45] This was a viewpoint which he enunciated in a number of articles. For example, "The Incompatibles," a lengthy analysis of Anglo-Irish relations, published in the _Nineteenth Century_ in April and June 1881, revealed Arnold once again as extremely censorious of English middle class society, but this time one of his main concerns was its effects on the Irish Catholic. For it was this society with which the Irish came most in contact. To the Irish English civilisation was middle class civilisation and it was one which they found abhorrent, for they did not appreciate its good qualities. Referring to Dickens' _David Copperfield_ which he felt captured middle class life exceedingly faithfully, Arnold wrote that this life was "repulsive" to the Irish, and that it was "all tarred with one brush, and that brush is Creakles."[46] The serious side of English civilisation appeared to the Irish in the personages of such middle class people as the hard, narrow, inconsiderate Mr. Murdstone and his sister Miss Murdstone, the inadequacies of whose life epitomised by their industry, religion, energy, firmness held little attraction for the very different Irish race. Nor indeed was the lighter side of English middle class life as represented by Mr. Quinion any more attractive.[47] If the serious Murdstone had been responsible for the manufacturing "Hell-holes," the unsatisfactory nature of Dissenting Protestantism, and for refusing to allow Irish Catholics to have their own schools and universities, it was Quinion who must bear the blame for the inadequacies of English art, popular songs, comedy, and general pleasurable pastimes, and especially the bad state of English architecture. Indeed, Quinion's influence had been pervasive in the streets of Dublin also--Arnold was here being contemptuous of what he considered to be the aesthetic disaster of Dublin Castle. Accordingly, "As the civilisation of the French middle class is the maker of the streets and buildings of modern Paris, so the civilisation of the English middle class is the maker of the streets and buildings of modern London and Dublin."[48] Furthermore, Arnold believed that the Irish, possessed of quicker minds than the English, must scoff at English efforts to coerce them, especially when such efforts were associated with the pedantries and formalities stemming from the love of liberty and complete lack of an instinct of logic and lucidity of a people represented by the likes of Murdstone and Quinion. Moreover, lacking these qualities themselves it was not surprising that the English middle class were responsible for the conspicuous absence of logic and lucidity in public business, an absence which proved to be somewhat less than attractive to the Irish. Arnold, ever the comparativist, relished the opportunity of juxtaposing the French and

English middle classes, in this regard declaring that "The immense, homogeneous, and (comparatively with ours) clear-thinking French middle class prides itself on logic and lucidity in its public business."[49] At any rate, it was clear to Arnold that the present bad civilisation of "our terrible friend the British Philistine" with its "pedantry, bigotry, and narrowness" did not render it very congenial in Irish eyes and he argued that if the present estrangement of the Irish from the English were to be removed then it was essential, in addition to undertaking other political processes, that this civilisation be improved: "if we wish cordially to attach Ireland to the English connection, not only must we offer healing political measures, we must also, and that as speedily as we can, transform our middle class and its social organisation."[50] Indeed, this was the thesis Arnold set forth in his Preface to Irish Essays (1882) ("The Incompatibles" was one of the Essays):

> English people keep asking themselves what we ought to do about Ireland. The great contention of these essays is, that in order to attach Ireland to us solidly, English people have not only to DO something different from what they have done hitherto, they have also to BE something different from what they have been hitherto. As a whole, as a community, they have to acquire a larger and sweeter temper, a larger and more lucid mind. And this is indeed no light task, yet it is the capital task now appointed to us, and our safety depends on our accomplishing it: to BE something different, much more, even, than to DO something different.[51]

During the 1880s Arnold displayed a growing interest in American life, writing a number of articles dealing with the civilisation there. Though he found much to praise he was generally critical in his comments. However, for our purposes these articles are particularly interesting for his frequent apposition of his various views on American Philistine society with corresponding views on the analogous society at home. For example, in March 1882 in "A Word about America" he stressed the similarity which he perceived to exist between the Philistinism of America and that of England. However, he acknowledged that there were some differences, an important distinction between the two countries being that the American people were nearly all Philistines with no Barbarians and few Populace, while in England there were three quite separate classes. In America the Philistines comprised "the great bulk of the nation; a livelier sort of Philistine than our Philistine middle class which made and peopled the United States--a livelier sort of Philistine than ours, and with the pressure and the false ideal of our Barbarian taken away, but left all the more to himself, and to have his full swing."[52] This article with its extensive treatment of the problems of American civilisation where the middle class was "virtually the nation," also provided the usual stern strictures, in what had now in effect become a set description, of the uncultured civilisation of the English Philistines:

> ...the English middle class presents us at this day, for our actual needs, and for the purposes of national civilisation, with a defective type of religion, a narrow range of intellect and knowledge, a stunted sense of beauty, a low standard of manners. For the building up of human life, as men are now beginning to see, there are needed not only the powers of industry and conduct, but the power, also, of intellect and knowledge, the power of beauty, the power of social life and manners. And that type of life of which our middle class in England are in possession is one by which neither the claims of intellect and knowledge are satisfied, nor the claim of beauty, nor the claims of social life and manners.[53]

In February 1885 appeared "A Word More about America," an essay of reflections about his recent tour in that country (he had not yet crossed the Atlantic when he wrote "A Word about America" in 1882), one of his main conclusions now being that the American Philistine was indeed quite different to his English counterpart.[54] But Arnold again devoted much attention to problems of English middle class society and especially to three of what he called the many confusions presently embarrassing England, that of foreign affairs, that of the House of Commons, that of Ireland. The person bearing much of the blame for these confusions was Arnold's usual foil, the British Philistine. For, declared Arnold quoting from his July 1880 article "The Future of Liberalism,"

> If our foreign policy is not that of "the British Philistine, with his likes and dislikes, his effusion and confusion, his hot and cold fits, his want of dignity and of the steadfastness which comes from dignity, his want of ideas and the steadfastness which comes from ideas," then all the world at the present time is, it must be owned, very much mistaken.[55]

It was an error, he continued, to imagine that it was Lord Granville who determined England's foreign policy; rather it was "a power behind Lord Granville." For Granville in his dealings with foreign Governments always waited to see how the cat would jump--"and that cat the British Philistine!" Similarly, the House of Commons was now a Philistine assembly, especially with Gladstone and his middle class Liberal Party at the helm:

> Can anything be more confused, more unnatural? That assembly has got into a condition utterly embarrassed, and seems impotent to bring itself right....Every day the House of Commons does not sit judicious people feel relief, every day that it sits they are oppressed with apprehension. Instead of being an edifying influence, as such an assembly

> ought to be, the House of Commons is at present an influence which does harm; it sets an example which rebukes and corrects none of the nation's faults, but rather encourages them.[56]

Again, that confusion which was Ireland was due in large measure to the policies emanating from the great middle class. Indeed, remarked Arnold, the only person who could believe that Ireland was constitutionally governed was "perhaps, that born swallower of all clap-trap, the British Philistine."[57]

Criticisms of England's middle class and their Philistinism are present in other of Arnold's writings on American subjects. In his lecture "Emerson," first delivered in Boston in December 1883 and then published the following May in Macmillan's Magazine, he dismissed "the British Philistine" as "a trying personage."[58] In the preface to Discourses in America, published in June 1885, he asserted that the "middle classes, the great Philistine power, have no perception of our real relations to the world abroad, no clue, apparently, for guidance, whenever that attractive and ever-victorious rhetorician, who is the Minister of their choice, may take them, except the formula of that submissive animal which carried the prophet Balaam."[59] Again, in "Civilisation in the United States," the written version of a lecture which he had delivered on three occasions in 1888 and which was published in April of that year, the month of his death, Arnold, as often before, declared that the middle class's instinct for conduct and business was much stronger than that for beauty.[60]

It should be manifest that English middle class civilisation was subject to much caustic criticism by Arnold throughout his prolific literary output and, moreover, that "Philistinism" was a particularly favourite epithet for delineating this obloquy. Though this all-embracing word admittedly referred primarily to what he considered to be the inadequate mental condition of this class, it of course extended to all their manifold actions which he condemned. Now, whether he was fair or not in his attribution there is no doubt that he was eminently successful in effecting an association in his readers' minds of the class and the epithet. The justice of the coupling may not have been agreed, but Philistinism invariably connoted middle class civilisation. Nevertheless, Arnold also provided various other criticisms of this civilisation besides those which have been discussed in this section under the heading of Philistinism. One of the chief of them was also identified by a label, namely Hebraism.

C) Middle Class Hebraism

Hebraism, a term repeated again and again on the pages of Culture and Anarchy (1869), and one which was borrowed from Heine, was a notable trait, in Arnold's eyes, of the English character. All of England's classes partook of it excessively but it was an attribute which the Philistine middle class had made peculiarly its own. He spoke in this work of "our dear old friend, the Hebraising Philistines," while in his later "'Ecce, Convertimur ad Gentes'" (1879) he referred to "our Judaic and unelastic middle class in this country."[61] Hebraism's characteristics, according to Arnold, included

> the insisting on perfection in one part of our nature and not in all; the singling out the moral side, the side of obedience and action, for such intent regard; making strictness of the moral

> conscience so far the principal thing, and putting off for hereafter, and for another world the care for being complete at all points, the full and harmonious development of our humanity.[62]

As he declared in St. Paul and Protestantism (1870), the word HEBRAISE denoted "the exclusive attention to the moral side of our nature, to conscience, and to doing rather than knowing."[63]

Thus, Hebraism was the obvious quality possessed by the earnest, energetic, hard-working Puritan Philistines; indeed Arnold could declare "that the strongest and most vital part of English Philistinism was the Puritan and Hebraising middle class, and that its Hebraising keeps it from culture and totality."[64] The inadequacy of the middle class in this respect was due to their lack of Hebraism's foil and contrast, Hellenism, which was essentially a synonym for many of the qualities favoured by Arnold, for example, right reason, harmonious perfectness, sweetness and light, GEIST, culture. Both Hebraism and Hellenism, he believed, were essential for the development of a well-balanced personality and must be both possessed in complementary measure.[65] He was concerned, as he wrote in St. Paul and Protestantism (1870), about

> how we are beginning visibly to suffer harm from attending in this one-sided way to Hebraism, and how we are called to develop ourselves more in our totality, on our perceptive and intelligential side as well as on our moral side....Hebraism strikes too exclusively upon one string in us; Hellenism does not address itself with serious energy enough to morals and righteousness. For our totality, for our general perfection, we need to unite the two; now the two are easily at variance....Both are eminently HUMANE, and for complete human perfection both are required; the second being the perfection of that side in us which is moral and acts, the first, of that side in us which is intelligential and perceives and knows.[66]

Similarly, in Culture and Anarchy(1869) we read:

> Whereas the idea of perfection at all points, the encouraging in ourselves spontaneity of consciousness, and letting a free play of thought live and flow around all our activity, the indisposition to allow one side of our activity to stand as so all-important and all-sufficing that it makes other sides indifferent,--this bent of mind in us may not only check us in following unreservedly a mean master-concern of any kind, but may even, also, bring new life and movement into that side of us with which alone Hebraism concerns itself, and awaken a healthier and less mechanical activity there. Hellenism may thus actually serve to further the designs of Hebraism. [67]

Accordingly, what the Hebraising Philistines and, in fact, the great majority of the English, most needed was "the development of our Hellenising instincts, seeking ardently the intelligible law of things, and making a stream of fresh thought play freely about our stock notions and habits."[68] For at the moment, and Arnold was adamant on this point, the middle class especially had a surfeit of the one, Hebraism, and far too little of the other, Hellenism, and though they did indeed possess a number of excellent qualities, they were quite obviously straitened by their incomplete development. As he wrote in the Preface to Culture and Anarchy (1869), it is "fixed in our minds that a more full and harmonious development of their humanity is what the Nonconformists most want, that narrowness, one-sidedness, and incompleteness is what they most suffer from; in a word, that in what we call PROVINCIALITY they abound, but in what we may call TOTALITY they fall short."[69] Moreover, it is clear that he firmly believed that his notions of Hellenism and Hebraism were of great import. In a letter to his mother on June 12, 1869 he declared that Culture and Anarchy (1869) "will have a considerable effect in the end, and the chapters on Hellenism and Hebraism are in the main, I am convinced, so true that they will form a kind of centre for English thought and speculation on the matters treated in them."[70] In another letter to his mother on June 7, 1870, almost a year later, he wrote: "You will like to see the enclosed from Church [later the Dean of St. Paul's]; his sense of the importance of the distinction I have drawn out between Hellenism and Hebraism shows his width of mind. It is a distinction on which more and more will turn, and on dealing wisely with it everything depends."[71]

Of course, the religious aspect of Hebraism, in Arnold's mind, was also very important. In Culture and Anarchy (1869) he stated that Hebraism was the tendency "to sacrifice all other sides of our being to the religious side"; in "Bishop Butler and the Zeit-Geist" (1876) he referred to it as the "deep and ardent occupation with righteousness and religion."[72] Furthermore, though he undoubtedly considered that Hebraism was by no means foreign to the Evangelical party within the Church of England, he deemed that it was especially connected with the various faces of the religion of Protestant Dissent or Nonconformity, the predominant religion of the middle class and one, despite some acknowledged virtues, which he generally found to be quite repugnant.

D) Middle Class Nonconformity

Religion was one of the great interests in Arnold's life and he wrote widely on a diversity of religious and theological topics. It is true that the tenets of his own particular creed are difficult to establish and there have been varying views concerning the precise brand of Christianity he supported. However, his own religion does not really concern us here. What is of greater import was his attitude towards the religious views of the middle classes, and there is no doubt that this attitude was not favourable. The religion of the great portion of the English middle class was that of Dissent or Nonconformity: "The stronghold of Nonconformity then, as now, was in the middle class"; "Our middle class, the great representative of trade and Dissent"; "the body of British Protestant Dissenters is in the main, as it undoubtedly is, the Church of the middle-class Philistines."[73] Sometimes Arnold in his discussion of middle class religion referred to it as Puritanism, a term generally synonymous with Nonconformity or Dissent: "the Nonconformists, the successors and representatives of the Puritans"; "the Nonconformists who are the special inheritors of the Puritan tradition."[74]

Indeed, he declared that there were as many as 138 different divisions of Dissenters in England, ranging from the large sects of the Presbyterians and Baptists to the smaller, more obscure ones of, for example, Ranters, Recreative Religionists, and Peculiar People.[75] In his 1886 "Common Schools Abroad" he remarked that it may be said "that amongst our Anglo-Saxon race a new sect often arose from the mere pleasure of making one."[76] Later, in "Disestablishment in Wales" (1888) he wrote that "the tendency to multiply sects is a misfortune to Protestantism; it may become a disease."[77] More often than not Arnold did not differentiate between the various sects, but lumped them together to bear the brunt of his disapproval. Sometimes, however, he did select individual sects for especial deprecation. For instance, as we read in "A Liverpool Address" (1882), he did not like the Salvation Army: "look at the Salvation Army and its operations. You will see numbers, funds, energy, devotedness, excitement, conversions--and a complete absence of lucidity. A little lucidity would make the whole movement impossible."[78] Similarly, in his 1887 review article "A 'Friend of God'" his antipathy to the lack of lucidity of the Salvation Army was again evident: "Our own nation is not especially lucid, it is strongly religious, we have witnessed in the Salvation Army the spectacle of one of the crudest and most turpid developments of religion with the element of mythology in full sway."[79] Elsewhere, he called this body "a materialistic fairytale."[80] Likewise, he did not think much of the intellectual status of Wesleyanism though, it must be acknowledged, he found other aspects of this denomination admirable:

> I have a sincere admiration for Wesley, and a sincere esteem for the Wesleyan Methodist body in this country; I have seen much of it, and for many of its members my esteem is not only sincere but also affectionate. I know how one's religious connections and religious attachments are determined by the circumstances of one's birth and bringing up; and probably, if I had been born and brought up among the Wesleyans, I should never have left their body. But certainly I should have wished my children to leave it; because to live with one's mind, in regard to a matter of absorbing importance as Wesleyans believe religion to be, to live with one's mind, as to a matter of this sort, fixed constantly upon a mind of the third order, such as was Mr. Wesley's, seems to me extremely trying and injurious for the minds of men in general.[81]

It should be pointed out also that Arnold by no means painted all brands of Dissent with the same brush for he acknowledged that sometimes great differences existed between sects. This was made clear in his "A Last Word on the Burials Bill" (1876), an article concerning whether or not Dissenters should be allowed to hold their burial services in the parish churchyard:

> Yet surely there is likely to be a wide difference between the observances of a great body like the Presbyterians, counting its adherents by hundreds of thousands, having existed for a long time, and possessing a well-known reason for existence,--counting, also, among its adherents, a great mass of educated people,--there is likely to be a wide difference between the observances of a body like this, and the observances of such a body, say, as the Peculiar People.[82]

Nevertheless, though he recognized that there existed a hierarchy of quality among the various Nonconforming denominations Arnold rarely wavered from his opinion that, in general, Dissent constituted an inferior creed. Even as early as February 1855 he had written to his mother: "Of all dull, stagnant, unedifying ENTOURAGES, that of middle-class Dissent, which environed Montgomery, seems to me the stupidest." [James Montgomery was a Moravian hymn writer who lived from 1771-1854.] [83] Years later in "The French Play in London" (1879) he was quite categoric in his assertion: "Undoubtedly the type of religion to which the British middle class has sacrificed the theatre, as it has sacrificed so much besides, is defective."[84] Similarly, in "The Future of Liberalism" (1880) there was a distinct caustic note in his dismissal of "the impossible and unlovely presentment of Christian dogmas and practice which is offered by the most important part of this nation, the serious middle class, and above all by its Nonconforming portion."[85]

His opinion of Nonconformity being such, it is perhaps understandable that he time and again stressed that the middle class's religious views and practices were in large measure responsible for the backward and incomplete nature of their characters and civilisation. As he remarked in A French Eton (1864), religion, so important and the source of so much strength to the middle class, had failed to give them perfection. While it had provided them with character on which they might build perfection it had not brought them culture. For armed only with its industry and Puritanism, its "business and BETHELS," the middle class carried little attraction for other men and would find it hard to assume power. Moreover, their inadequacy, according to Arnold, was particularly evident in the sphere of religion, for here "where feeling and beauty are so all-important, we shrink from giving to the middle class spirit, limited as we see it, with its sectarianism, its under-culture, its intolerance, its bitterness, its unloveliness, too much its own way, we insist on its making itself into something larger, newer, more fruitful."[86] Arnold's opinion of the lack of attraction held by Nonconformity was also painted ironically in Culture and Anarchy (1869):

> Look at the life imaged in such a newspaper as the Nonconformist,--a life of jealousy of the Establishment, disputes, tea-meetings, openings of chapels, sermons; and then think of it as an ideal of a human life completing itself on all sides, and aspiring with all its organs after sweetness, light, and perfection![87]

It is hardly surprising that a little later he declared: "I cannot at once accept the Nonconformity any more than the industrialism and the other great works of our Liberal middle class as proof positive that this class is in possession of light."[88] In like manner, "Modern Dissent," which was the preface to the first (1870) edition of St. Paul and Protestantism, found Arnold quoting Corinthians II, "'Strife, jealousy, wrath, contentions, backbitings'" and declaring that the Dissenters by their own admittance were full of these; they themselves confessed that their temper and habits were those very ones which Christianity whose essence was "mildness and sweet reasonableness" was specifically against.[89] A few pages later he asked rhetorically why the ordinary middle class Philistine was so attracted by Dissent:

> Is it not, as to discipline, that his self-importance is fomented by the fuss, bustle, and partisanship of a private sect, instead of being lost in the greatness of a public body? As to worship, is it not that his taste is pleased by usages and words that come down to HIM, instead of drawing him up to THEM; by services which reflect, instead of the culture of great men of religious genius, the crude culture of himself and his fellows? And as to doctrine, is it not that his mind is pleased at hearing no opinion but its own, by having all disputed points taken for granted in its own favour, by being urged to no return upon itself, no development.[90]

Several years afterwards, in Literature and Dogma, which appeared in February 1873, Arnold compared the modern Dissenters with the Pharisees of Jesus' time. Both groups, he declared, though possessing a real concern for religion, had no understanding at all of what religion truly is and "by their temper, attitude, and aims" did their utmost to make religion impossible.[91]

This castigation of Dissent and Nonconformity and of what Arnold considered to be the unbalanced development and unlovely life of their numerous middle class supporters recurs and recurs. Turning to the preface to God and the Bible, published in November 1875, we find Arnold waxing contemptuously on the lectures and religious views of the American lay evangelist D.L. Moody who spent two years in the first half of the 1870s conducting revival meetings throughout Britain. But he was just as contemptuous of Moody's typical audience which was "chiefly made up from the main body of lovers of our popular religion--the serious and steady middle class, with its bounded horizons."[92] Indeed, he returned to a consideration of these meetings in March 1878 in his essay "Equality" where he quoted a French correspondent of the Siècle newspaper who wrote of his reaction to some of the evangelical meetings of Moody and his organist Ira Sankey:

> To understand the success of Messrs. Moody and Sankey, one must be familiar with English manners, one must know the mind-deadening influence of a narrow Biblism, one must have experienced the sense of acute ennui, which the aspect and the frequentation of the great division of English society produce in others, the want of elasticity and the chronic ennui which characterise this class itself, petrified in a narrow Protestantism and in a perpetual reading of the Bible.[93]

Moreover, he acknowledged that the Frenchman's criticism contained much truth for since entering the prison of Puritanism in the seventeenth century, the middle class had cultivated the serious, religious side of human life while neglecting the side of intellectual knowledge, that of beauty, and that of social life and manners.[94] As he declared in a letter to The Times of May 22, 1886, the political Dissenters "know little and prize little beyond...their dissent."[95] In short, Dissent, in Arnold's view, had been a major agency in keeping England's middle class from attaining what he held to be real progress, a belief clearly enunciated in a letter to his mother on November 13, 1869, shortly after the publication of the first two articles of the three which made up St. Paul and Protestantism: "whether I have rendered St. Paul's ideas with perfect correctness or not, there is no doubt that the confidence with which these people [the Puritan class] regarded their conventional rendering of them was so baseless, made them narrow and intolerant, and prevented all progress."[96] Three days later, a letter from Arnold to the Rev. Charles Kegan Paul declared:

> I have gone for nearly twenty years among the Protestant Dissenters, and am convinced that their stated assurance that they clearly possess the undoubted unadulterated Gospel in the theology which passes current among them, is an absolute stoppage to all real progress and mental activity in them--and if in them, in a good large part of the nation ~~and o~~ne of the strongest parts.[97]

Furthermore, he had little confidence that continued adherence to Dissent would ever lead the middle class to his ideal of culture and light. As he declared quite categorically in his 1882 "An Eton Boy," so long as the middle class continued with its popular Protestantism to focus on the next life while ignoring the present one, thereby acting contrarily to Jesus' own words, their politics, culture, and civilisation would remain "narrowed and perverted."[98] In fine, Arnold had few doubts that the salvation of English middle class society would have little to do with their pervasive Nonconforming religion.

In a number of writings, and particularly his preface to the 1874 edition of the chapters on Germany from his 1868 Schools and Universities on the Continent, entitled Higher Schools and Universities in Germany, Arnold dealt with the problem of establishing a Catholic university for Ireland. Though he was very much in favour of funding a distinctly Catholic institution, he clearly understood that the English authorities were against it, and that the middle class Dissenting faction, whom he considered bigoted, constituted the main force behind this antagonistic, anti-Catholic attitude. However, he argued that the situation was very different in Prussia where attitudes towards Catholics were free of the "popular prejudice and clap-trap" pervading the English middle class.[99] His discussion of why Ireland should have a Catholic University and why the English Philistines were against instituting one do not really concern us here, but the preface is important for illustrating once again Arnold's hostility to what he considered to be the narrowness, prejudice, insularity, bigotry, and general intellectual inadequacy of a large portion of the great middle class Dissenting population: "A swarm of private religious sects wastes power; it absorbs for its machinery, squabbles, and gossip, force of brain which might be better employed, and is not good, therefore, for mental progress. Not much of English thought comes from the Dissenters."[100] Indeed, he could express the perhaps extreme opinion that the Dissenters, though possessing good qualities, constituted for England of all the obstacles to civilisation "the greatest."[101] Accordingly, if the attaining of progress in England necessitated, with respect to the most important matters, "getting just, clear, well-ordered thoughts about them, and setting at defiance clap-trap and catchwords,"[102] then it was clear that the mental condition of the Dissenting Philistine, who played such an important part in the governance of the country, had to be changed. In a long letter to the Pall Mall Gazette of April 8, 1875, Arnold further considered the necessity of instituting a Catholic university in Ireland and again contrasted English attitudes with the very different ones of the Prussians. The negative English attitude, he wrote, was due "to two fanaticisms: a Secularist fanaticism which holds religion in general to be noxious, and, above all, a Protestant fanaticism which holds Catholicism to be idolatory."[103] He ended his letter by declaring that he continued to believe that "our treatment of Catholicism is dictated solely by that old friend of ours--strong, steady, honest, well-disposed but withal somewhat narrow-minded and hard-natured--the British Philistine."[104] It was unnecessary for him to add that the vast majority of these Philistines were Dissenting Protestants rather than Secularists.

Arnold was not invariably antagonistic to Dissent. For all its faults in the intellectual and doctrinal sphere he thought that it was a primary cause for some of the good character qualities of which the middle class were possessed. In "An Eton Boy" (1882) we read: "crude and faulty as is the type of religion offered by Puritanism, narrow and false as is its conception of human life, materialistic and impossible as is its world to come, yet the seriousness, soberness, and devout energy of Puritanism are a prize, once won, never to be lost; they are a possession to our race for ever."[105] Likewise, in "Numbers" (1884), though declaring his clear awareness of the shortcomings of the Puritan discipline and asserting that he by no means wished it to remain unchanged, he acknowledged that he considered that as a character builder Puritanism had been "invaluable."[106] Nevertheless, despite his occasional praise for the Dissenters' "fine qualities and energies," Arnold always held that their religion would suffer eclipse and, as he put it in "A Last Word on the Burials Bill" (1876), "fail in the end."[107] Even though he acknowledged that there were "Seriousness and strenuousness and manliness and uprightness" associated with middle class Nonconformity he had little doubt, as he declared in the Preface to the Second Edition of Higher Schools and Universities in Germany (1874) that "religious history's final sentence on this cause, whatever praise political history may bestow on it, will be a severe one. It will say of it, even after all its advocates have been heard and everything has been weighed which tells in its favour, that in temper and contentiousness it began, by temper and contentiousness it perished."[108] Nonconformity, as then constituted, had little place in Arnold's vision of a truly cultured England.

E) The Participation of the Middle Class in the Religion of Inequality

A major inadequacy, in Arnold's opinion, of English society in general was the gross inequality rampant in the nation, and he viewed the middle class, because of their role in the proliferation of this inequality, as being particularly subject to censure. It was a topic which received extensive treatment in the important 1878 essay "Equality." In the first part of this work Arnold argued at length that France's pre-eminent civilisation and the humanisation of her classes were due largely to her great measure of social equality which had stemmed from the events of 1789; such social equality had produced the pervasive "goodness and agreeableness of life there, and for so many."[109] In England, on the other hand, things were very different; for in that country, the three social classes were greatly lacking in true civilisation and humanity. Furthermore, he argued that the English middle class, for the usual reasons which he had cited over and over in his other writings, and notwithstanding their good qualities such as sense of conduct, earnestness, energy, honesty, must appear to a Frenchman as especially defective in this regard. Moreover, the reason for this general uncivilisedness permeating English society was due, in large measure, to her inequality: "or in other words, that the great inequality of classes and property, which came to us from the Middle Age and which we maintain because we have the religion of inequality, that this constitution of things, I say, has the natural and necessary effect, under present circumstances, of materialising our upper class, vulgarising our middle class, and brutalising our lower class. And this is to fail in civilisation."[110] The great problem of the materialisation of the aristocracy was that, with its enormous wealth and luxury and high level of social life and manners, it was totally unattainable to most of the middle class apart from a minority who composed a class of newly enriched gentlemen. Accordingly, the Philistines were left to themselves with their inadequate religion, intellect, knowledge, sense of beauty, and manners. In short, they were vulgarised. For the lower classes, furthermore, the level of the aristocracy was even more out of their reach than it was for the middle class, while the civilisation of the middle class itself held little attraction for them. Thus, they were left to their brutalised state. It was in this manner, insisted Arnold, that inequality was responsible for the materialisation, vulgarisation, and brutalisation of the three classes.[111] His argument led him irresistibly to an inevitable conclusion:

> Our present social organisation, however, will and must endure until our middle class is provided with some better ideal of life than it has now. Our present organisation has been an appointed stage in our growth; it has been of good use, and has enabled us to do great things. But the use is at an end, and the stage is over. Ask yourselves if you do not sometimes feel in yourselves a sense, that in spite of the strenuous efforts for good of so many excellent persons amongst us, we begin somehow to flounder and to beat the air; that we seem to be finding ourselves stopped on this line of advance

> and on that, and to be threatened with a sort of standstill. It is that we are trying to live on with a social organisation of which the day is over. Certainly equality will never of itself alone give us a perfect civilisation. But, with such inequality as ours, a perfect civilisation is impossible.[112]

A few months later in "Irish Catholicism and British Liberalism" (1878) Arnold again contended that the excesses for which the English love of inequality had been responsible must be remedied and fundamental social changes effected. Such excesses had been particularly detrimental to the middle classes, "whose narrowness and whose imperfect civilisation every cultivated man amongst us perceives and deplores," and had been the cause of throwing this class "in upon itself, and giving it over to the narrownesses, and prejudices, and hideousnesses, which many people regard as incurable, but which are not."[113]

In November 1878 in his "'Porro Unum Est Necessarium'" Arnold continued his attack on the civilisation of the English middle class, once again putting forward what he considered to be the French opinion rather than his own--though they were the same--of the condition of these Philistines. He represented the French reproach as centring on the unsatisfactory nature of both the graver, more serious portion as well as the lighter, pleasure-seeking element of the English middle classes, and he stressed that this was "not an expression of the feeling merely of a fastidious upper class or of a superfine individual, it [was] the genuine sentiment of the mass of middle-class France."[114] But, declared Arnold, it was not surprising that the Frenchman of this class perceived so clearly the unsatisfactory nature of the corresponding class in England since his level of civilisation was "so comparatively high."[115] Furthermore, much of the reason for the different standards of middle class life in France and England, considered the logical and lucid middle class French, must be due to the very different attitudes towards equality which pevailed in the two nations. In France, equality accounted for the great present strength of the middle class, as well as for its future hopes, whereas the English middle class was suffused by "the religion of inequality." Arnold imagined a middle class Frenchman remarking:

> With your enormous inequality of conditions and property, a middle class is naturally thrown back upon itself and upon an inferior type of social life and of civilisation. Add to this your want of public schools for this class, and that it is brought up anyhow, brought up in hugger-mugger, brought up on the second plane;--its being thrown back upon an inferior type of social life and of civilisation is an irresistible necessity. In France we have got equality, and we bring up our middle class on the first plane; hence French civilisation. [116]

Similarly, in his lecture "'Ecce, Convertimur ad Gentes,'" delivered shortly afterwards in January 1879, Arnold reiterated what he regarded as the defects in English civilisation resulting from "the immense inequalities of condition and property" pervading society, and again talked of the three classes being respectively materialised, vulgarised, and brutalised.[117] All classes suffered, even the Barbarians, and he was emphatic that the Philistines just as much as the Populace were marred, stunted, and maintained in a state of imperfection by the inequalitarian nature of society. His main conclusion was "that for modern civilisation some approach to equality is necessary, and that an enormous inequality like ours is a hindrance to our civilisation."[118] Thus, the rampant inequality in England, which Arnold considered played such a significant part in keeping the middle classes in an unsatisfactory state, had to be eradicated, and as we shall see later, he was convinced that one of the best ways of effecting this was to be through the establishment of a thorough State system of secondary schools.

F) The Association of the Middle Class with the Liberal Party

Arnold's great interest in all the various political affairs of the day is evident throughout his wide output and it is not surprising that his strictures on the English middle class extended to their political beliefs. Now, Arnold's own political views as well as those of the middle class itself during the almost half-century when he commented on English politics constitute a study which is far too complex to be covered in a few short pages. However, in order to provide some further indication of the disdain which he often displayed to very many of this class brief reference will be made to some of his views on their involvement with the Liberal Party. For if it is ever possible to identify a political party with a particular social class then there would be much truth in the assertion that the Liberal Party and the middle class during the period of Arnold's life were very closely connected. In fact, Arnold himself very often coupled the two entities; for example, he spoke of "our Liberal middle-class Parliament" and "the great Liberal middle class"; "the class which furnishes the great body of what is called the Liberal interest."[119] Frequently, the association was expressed in not very complimentary terms: "the opinion of that great ruling class amongst us on which Liberal Governments have hitherto had to depend for support--the Philistines or middle class"; "The Tories...do not, like a Liberal Government, lean on that class whose vulgarity makes it hard for a Minister, who wants to please them, not to make England look ridiculous, vain-boastful, and ignoble."[120] In addition, Arnold often spoke of the connection between the middle class Nonconformists and the Liberal party, declaring, for example, in Culture and Anarchy (1869), that "the Nonconformists make the strength of the Liberal Majority in the House of Commons" and referring in "Irish Catholicism and British Liberalism" (1878) to the "Puritan Nonconformist cause, which, in this country, Liberals are always tempted to think themselves safe in supporting."[121] Likewise, in "An Eton Boy" (1882) he spoke disparagingly of "that figure we know so well, the earnest and nonconforming Liberal of our middle classes, as his schools and his civilisation have made him."[122] Of course, the Liberal Party included many who did not adhere to a Nonconforming, or any other, religion, for there were many amongst its members who disdained all religion, namely the Utilitarians or Benthamites. Arnold in his Friendship's Garland (1871) satirized this group in the person of the "self-made middle-class" Mr. Bottles:

> a radical of the purest water; quite one of the Manchester school. He was one of the earliest free-traders; he has always gone as straight as an arrow about Reform; he is an ardent voluntary in every possible line, opposed the Ten Hours' Bill, was one of the leaders of the Dissenting opposition out of Parliament which smashed up the education clauses of Sir James Graham's Factory Act; and he paid the whole expenses of a most important church-rate contest out of his own pocket. And, finally, he looks forward to marrying his deceased wife's sister. Table, as my friend Mr. Grant Duff says, the whole Liberal creed, and in not a single point of it will you find Bottles tripping![123]

While it is outside the scope of this study to discuss Arnold's views on all the various policies of the Liberal Party about which he wrote extensively, it must at least be emphasized that he was contemptuous of very many of them--"the old stale and damnable iteration of the Liberal clap-traps" as he observed in a letter to M.E. Grant Duff in 1868.[124] In addition to those policies mentioned above which were pursued by Bottles Arnold criticized at length Liberal policies on the Home Rule question, especially as advocated by the "Cleon" Gladstone[125], on the disestablishment of the Church in Ireland, on the institution of a Catholic university in Ireland, on the burial services permitted to Dissenters in parish churchyards, on the temperance question, among many others. But if there was one prime reason why Arnold was at odds with this Party's policies it was because, as he wrote to his sister K (Jane Martha) just after the Liberal defeat in the 1874 General Election, "the Liberal party, it seemed to me, had no body of just, clear, well-ordered thought upon politics."[126] He rarely ascribed the attributes of GEIST, lucidity, science, or culture to their courses of action or reforms; rather, he was much more liable to call them mere "machinery, requiring not much insight or thought to make them."[127] Reason, in Arnold's view, was too frequently absent from the Liberal slate and what they actually achieved was "very often not 'as reason would.'"[128] For example, writing in Culture and Anarchy (1869) of the power underlying the Liberal party's attempt to disestablish the Irish Church Arnold denied that it was "the power of reason and justice."[129] Accordingly, it is little surprising that he became assured that the activities of this Party, as he declared in "Irish Catholicism and British Liberalism" (1878), "wanted more of simple and sincere thought to direct them," especially as Liberalism's problems could "be found to lie in its having followed hitherto with a too eager solicitude the wishes of a class narrow-minded and imperfectly civilised."[130] For, how could the Liberals be otherwise considering they were mostly composed of Philistines? Writing to his sister K (Jane Martha) in April 1880 Arnold dismissed "the Radical Bottles, and middle-class Liberalism—in general" as being "in a very crude state, and with little light or help in them at present."[131] Six years later, in connection with Gladstone's policy of Home Rule he wrote of "the mass of middle class Liberalism" as being "so ignorant."[132]

But the Liberal Party, as Arnold stated on a number of occasions, never attempted to improve or transform its middle class members. On the contrary, the policies of this Party and the inadequacies of Philistine civilisation combined to complement and suit each other very well. As he declared in his July 1879 "The Future of Liberalism," Liberal statesmen had displayed little tendency to appeal to man's higher and nobler instincts and while they had recently begun to pay some little attention to basic schooling for the lower class, they had almost totally ignored the development of the middle class's instinct for intellect and knowledge and their sense for beauty and manners. Rather, it was the middle class's love of expansion, with their love of trade, their love of political liberty, with which Liberal statesmen were especially concerned and to which they invariably appealed.[133] The Liberal refusal to try to change the middle class was also pointed out by Arminius in Friendship's Garland (1871): "Your 'earnest Liberal' in England thinks culture all moonshine; he is for the spiritual development of your democracy by rioting in the parks, abolishing church-rates, and marrying a deceased wife's sister; and for leaving your narrow and vulgar middle class...just as it is."[134] Similarly in "Equality" (1878) Arnold declared that "Liberals tend to accept the middle class as it is, and to praise the nonconformists."[135] Consequently, he asked in "The Future of Liberalism" (1879), how could the Liberals "be said, any more than the Tories, to grasp that idea of civilisation which is the secret of the life of our community and of the life of the future?--to grasp the idea fully, and with potent effort to work for it?"[136] For they concerned themselves with policies which were not really so important and even if, in fact, they were successfully implemented English civilisation would remain imperfect "and the real work of Liberal statesmen" would still have to be accomplished.[137] As he remarked in Culture and Anarchy (1869):

> Everything, in short confirms us in the doctrine, so unpalatable to the believers in action, that our main business at the present moment is not so much to work away at certain crude reforms of which we have already the scheme in our own mind, as to create, through the help of that culture which at the very outset we began by praising and recommending, a frame of mind out of which the schemes of really fruitful reforms may with time grow. [138]

Accordingly, he insisted in "The Future of Liberalism" (1879), since the problems of middle class civilisation emanated

> not from an insufficient care for political liberty and for trade, nor yet from an insufficient care for conduct, but from an insufficient care for intellect and knowledge and beauty and a humane life, let Liberal statesmen despise and neglect for the cure of our present imperfection no means, whether of public schools, now wanting, or of the theatre, now left to itself and to chance, or of anything else which may powerfully conduce to the communication and propagation of real intelligence, and of real beauty, and of a life really

humane.[139]

Though the Liberal Party, in Arnold's view, was doing little to improve its middle class members but, on the contrary, was helping to maintain them in their uncivilised state, he still had a certain optimism that the Liberals could effect the requisite transformation: "And perhaps, as time goes on, they will even turn resolutely round and look their middle-class friends full in the face and tell them of their imperfections, and try to cure them."[140] Nevertheless, in his May 1886 "The Nadir of Liberalism" written in the midst of the furore about Gladstone's proposal of Home Rule for Ireland, a plan which Arnold abhorred, he now took the opportunity to castigate quite thoroughly the Liberal Party with all its various policies, and particularly the failure over the previous fifteen years of his "young literary and intellectual friends, the lights of Liberalism...to work inwardly upon the predominant force in our politics--the great middle class--and to cure its spirit."[141] The main purpose of this essay, as the title implies, was to stress the abysmally low depths to which Arnold considered the Liberal Party had sunk, this fall in very large measure having been brought about by the imcompetence, boundedness, and backwardness of its members; "the mass of the great Liberal Party," he held, was "crude and without insight."[142] So, towards the end of his life Arnold was still caustically echoing his complaints of previous decades concerning this Party and, indeed, his criticisms if anything were now becoming more virulent. Certainly, he had some respect for what he called "the true Liberal ideal" [143] but little if any for the actual policies of the Liberal Party--that is why he came to call himself "a Liberal of the future."[144] It is true that now in 1886 Arnold recognized that the composition of the Party was gradually changing with the middle class, "the class where lay the strength of the Liberal Party until the other day," making way for "the working class, which conjointly with the middle class makes its strength now."[145] But it is also clear that he continued to hold that very many of the problems of the Liberals were due to the manifold faults of the Philistines. Accordingly, towards the end of this essay he was quite insistent that in order to ensure the modern development of England there was need for "all reasonable Liberals" to work together with "all reasonable Conservatives," with one of the most important tasks of their cooperation being to develop the middle class. This would be achieved by the introduction of a thorough system of local government and also, and here Arnold once again reiterated one of his favourite prescriptions, by an improved educational provision.[146]

G) "and the conclusion is, that our middle class and its civilisation require to be transformed."[147]

It should be stated that Arnold sometimes admitted that the middle class was possessed of admirable qualities; nevertheless, any praise of such was generally compounded with negative criticism. For example, in October 1854 he wrote to his wife while on a visit to Oxford of the apathy, of the lack of interest in work, and of the general religious stagnation which he found pervading the university. Still, he remarked that "we must hope that the coming changes, and perhaps the infusion of Dissenters' sons of that muscular, hard-working, UNBLASÉ middle class--for it is this, in spite of its abominable disagreeableness--may brace the flaccid sinews of Oxford a little."[148] Even the middle class's Philistinism was acknowledged to confer certain benefits. In On the Study of Celtic Literature (1866) he declared that even though he was often regarded as its "mortal enemy" he considered that it possessed "a soul of goodness" which he, as everyone else, appreciated. Its importance resided in the fact that it eventually led to science, "to the comprehension and interpretation of the world," though he observed that it was more likely to attain the level of science in Germany than in Great Britain. At home Philistinism

> seems at a certain point to meet with a conflicting force, which checks it and prevents its pushing on to science; but before reaching this point what conquests has it not won! and all the more, perhaps, for stopping short at this point, for spending its exertions within a bounded field, the field of plain sense, of direct practical utility. How it has augmented the comforts and conveniences of life for us! Doors that open, windows that shut, locks that turn, razors that shave, coats that wear, watches that go, and a thousand more such good things, are the invention of the Philistines.[149]

Thus Arnold, much of whose life's work was devoted towards ridding his countrymen, especially those of his own middle class, of the excesses of Philistinism and in so doing of transforming society, was by no means blind to the good practical effects emanating from this disposition. However, despite the good qualities to be found among the middle class he remained convinced that they would not be enough to save either the class itself or the country. On the contrary, there was a prime necessity that this class be transformed. As he declared in "Irish Catholicism and British Liberalism" (1878):

> the great work to be done in this country, and at this hour, is not with the lower class, but with the middle; a work of raising its whole level of civilisation, and, in order to do this, of

> transforming the British Puritan....The Puritan middle class, with all its faults, is still the best stuff in this nation. Some have hated and persecuted it, many have flattered and derided it,--flattered it that while they deride it they may use it; I have believed in it. It is the best stuff in this nation, and in its success is our best hope for the future. But to succeed it must be transformed.[150]

Moreover, Arnold consistently stressed that a perfected middle class would contribute a great benefit to England's progress and future. As he observed years earlier in A French Eton (1864):

> But in a transformed middle class, in a middle class raised to a higher and more genial culture, we may find, not perhaps Jerusalem, but, I am sure, a notable stage towards it. In that great class, strong by its numbers, its energy, its industry, strong by its freedom from frivolity, not by any law of nature prone to immobility of mind, actually at this moment agitated by a spreading ferment of mind, in that class, liberalised by an ampler culture, admitted to a wider sphere of thought, living by larger ideas, with its provincialism dissipated, its intolerance cured, its pettinesses purged away,--what a power there will be, what an element of new life for England! Then let the middle class rule, then let it affirm its own spirit, when it has thus perfected itself.[151]

Furthermore, in accomplishing this "they will indirectly confer a great boon upon the lower class also" who will then "have, in a cultured, liberalised, ennobled, transformed middle class, a point towards which it may hopefully work, a goal towards which it may with joy direct its aspirations."[152]

But in the middle class's present condition the shortcomings of its members, in Arnold's view, were blatant in a multitude of different spheres, one of the most prominent of which and the one bearing the blame for causing many of the others being centred on their imperfect mental condition. Moreover, he felt it to be irrefutable that this deficiency in the intellectual vision of the middle class could be brought into sharper focus by contrasting its members with their Continental counterparts, above all the Germans and French, who, despite their own evident failings, were imbued with that special lucidity which made them particularly suited to meet the modern Zeitgeist. While Arnold undoubtedly knew that it was well-nigh impossible to pin-point with complete exactitude why these foreigners enjoyed precedence over his own compatriots in this regard, from early on he became convinced that their educational systems constituted a most important factor underlying this superiority. Their public, State-run educational institutions, particularly those at the secondary and higher levels, were responsible for inculcating in the French and German middle classes the lucidity so manifestly lacking, according to Arnold, in the English Philistines, and which was so urgently required in the new modern age. England, on the contrary, throughout the whole of the nineteenth century had no State system of secondary schools; all schools at this level were completely private, and very many of them, Arnold firmly believed, were of appallingly low standard. In like manner, though he was not blind to the good points of the universities, he regarded England's higher educational institutions as totally inadequate. They may have sufficed when only the upper classes continued their education after the secondary level, but now the middle classes in increasing numbers were clamouring to partake of higher educational opportunities. The following chapter contains an examination of why exactly he considered his country's post-elementary institutions were grossly deficient, especially when contrasted with those of the Continent, and also of his conviction that a thorough

State-run educational system in England would constitute a most efficacious step in transforming the British Liberal Dissenting and Philistine middle class.

REFERENCES

1. "My Countrymen," *Prose Works* 5:7.

2. Ibid., p. 15.

3. Ibid., p. 20.

4. Ibid., pp. 21-22.

5. In a July, 1864 letter to Harriet Martineau the condition of England's middle and working classes was treated quite harshly vis-à-vis that of France's: "What gives France its power is, it seems to me, that the nation is *alive*, alive in mind and spirit I mean, down so much further into the body of the community than here. This they get from their Revolution and the electric shock it [?] whole people. There are the highly cultivated and intelligent people here as there--but, besides these, the middle and lower class there seem to have been touched by an electric current of mind and soul which prepares them for modern society and its new conditions--and this current seems not yet to have reached the middle and lower classes here. It is very difficult to make oneself understand just as one wishes on these matters--but I cannot help thinking that if I could take you about with me among the middling and working class in France, you would see what I mean, and feel the rawness and undeveloped state of our own middle class more than you do now. There is a movement beginning among them, however; but, so far, not extending much, that I can see, beyond the professional class." (Letter to Harriet Martineau, July 7, 1864, *The A.K. Davis-Matthew Arnold Collection*, Univ. of Virginia Library, No. 4885, Box 15).

6. "Heinrich Heine," *Prose Works* 3:112.

7. *On the Study of Celtic Literature*, *Prose Works* 3:390. See also Ibid., pp. 385-386.

8. Letter to his sister K (Jane Martha), November 14, 1863, Russell, *Letters* 1:207.

9. "The Nadir of Liberalism," *Prose Works* 11:54.

10. Letter to his sister K (Jane Martha), February 17, 1856, Russell. *Letters* 1:50.

11. Letter to Miss Arnold, November 21, 1859, Ibid., 1:109.

12. Introd. to *The Popular Education of France*, *Prose Works* 2:23.

13. Ibid., p. 24.

14. Letter to Harriet Martineau, July 24, 1860, *The A.K. Davis-Matthew Arnold Collection*, Univ. of Virginia Library, No. 4885, Box 15.

15. Similarly, in a letter to Thomas Arnold, Jr., dated December 21, 1861, Arnold wrote: "You used to be very fond of that parody of the English middle classes, with all their energy, acuteness, self confidence, narrowness of soul, and vulgarity, the American nation." Further on he referred to these classes' "Americanism". [The A.K. Davis-Matthew Arnold Collection, Univ. of Virginia Library, No. 4885, Box 14 (Ms. Kirsch's transcript)].

16. The Popular Education of France, Prose Works 2:25-26.

17. A French Eton, Prose Works 2:306.

18. Ibid., p. 307.

19. Letter to Richard Holt Hutton, April 15, 1864, The A.K. Davis-Matthew Arnold Collection, Univ. of Virginia Library, No. 4885, Box 15 (Ms. Kirsch's transcript)].

20. On the Study of Celtic Literature, Prose Works 3:295-296.

21. Culture and Anarchy, Prose Works 5:186.

22. Irony was the weapon very consciously chosen by Arnold to emphasise his message: "...but for my part I see more and more what an effective weapon, in a confused, loud-talking, clap-trappy country like this, where every writer and speaker to the public tends to say rather more than he means, is irony, or according to the strict meaning of the original Greek word, the saying rather less than one means. The main effect I have had on the mass of noisy claptrap and inert prejudice which chokes us has been, I can see, by the use of this weapon; and now, where people's minds are getting widely disturbed and they are beginning to ask themselves whether they have not a great deal that is new to learn, to increase this feeling in them irony is more useful than ever." [Letter to his mother, December 5, 1867, The A.K. Davis-Matthew Arnold Collection, Univ. of Virginia Library, No. 4885, Box 16 (Ms. Kirsch's transcript)].

23. Culture and Anarchy, Prose Works 5:140.

24. Ibid., pp. 97-98.

25. "The Incompatibles," Prose works 9:271.

26. "Civilisation in the United States," Prose Works 11:355; also p. 365. See also "The Future of Liberalism," Prose Works 9:147.

27. Culture and Anarchy, Prose Works 5:99.

28. Ibid., p. 130; pp. 127-134. A particular brand of Philistinism which Arnold felt was pervasive in English society and which was far from providing the urgently needed "intellectual deliverance" in the "epoch of dissolution and transformation" the country had

entered was that set of doctrines known as Utilitarianism or Benthamism. Indeed, he took umbrage in a witty manner in the preface to his 1865 collection Essays in Criticism at the pronouncement of the Saturday Review that the present epoch of transformation was now completed and that England's search for a new philosophy was over with the acceptance of the teachings of Bentham. He jestingly rejected this creed so beloved of the middle class "of which," he declared, "I am myself a feeble unit," asserting also that the British nation could not rest satisfied with Benthamism as "the last word of its philosophy." The products of Benthamism fell far short of what he held as the ideal of the cultured, perfected, lucid Englishman of the middle class. He painted a witty picture of a typical middle class Benthamite whom he met (or pretended to have met) on the Woodford Branch of the Great Eastern Railway Lines, a "respectable man, whom I imagined to be going up to London to serve his shop, or to buy shares, or to attend an Exeter Hall meeting, or to assist at the deliberations of the Maryleborne vestry, ... even, perhaps, in real truth, on a pious pilgrimage, to obtain from Mr. Bentham's executors a sacred bone of his great, dissected master." (Preface to Essays in Criticism, Prose Works 3:288-289. See also God and the Bible, Prose Works 7: 233-234). Such a man, Arnold felt, was by no means atypical of the British Philistine.

29. Friendship's Garland, Letter I, Prose Works 5:41.

30. Ibid., p. 42.

31. Ibid., Letter II, p. 46.

32. Ibid., Letter IX, p. 329.

33. Ibid., p. 330.

34. Ibid., p. 331.

35. Ibid., pp. 332-333.

36. Ibid., Letter X, p. 339.

37. Letter to his mother, July 5, 1865, Russell, Letters 1:288.

38. Letter to Wyndham Slade, September 12, 1865, Ibid., 1:300.

39. Letter to W.E. Forster, September 30, 1865, Ibid., 1:305.

40. Letter to his mother, Sunday, August 18, 1871, Ibid., 2:60.

41. On the Study of Celtic Literature, Prose Works 3:341-342; also p. 351.

42. Schools and Universities on the Continent, Prose Works 4:288; see also pp. 229-230.

43. Austria was much more to Arnold's liking than North Germany, a feeling which was most evident in a letter to his mother from Vienna, dated September 17, 1865: "This is a different world from North Germany, and to me a far pleasanter one. It is also in agreement with all my notions that one unmixed element having it all its own way, as in North Germany, should not be such a success as a mixture and compromise between different elements such as one sees here. Although, to be sure, in one sense, in the vulgar sense, Prussia is much more of a success than Austria: but I mean that the Austrians are more what pleases and interests a good, central, human taste, and more what one with such a taste would wish his own nation to be. It is odd how one is struck with the analogy between Prussia and the United States, in both having the pretentiousness, jealousy and instability of a parvenu nation whereas in Austria as in England and France, the national feeling seems to rest upon an indisputable, great past, and to be more dignified and serene in consequence. Then, too, here one finds, in all Europe, the one country where national government alike do thoroughly cling to England and believe in her, and believe in her alliance, hardly as she may have used them, as the one thing desirable and salutary for them: and in fact, when one is here, everything contributes to give one a tenderness for Austria and a desire that she should get out of her difficulties. This place is very pleasant, but not, as a city, so beautiful as I expected; but the population after the Berlin and Dresden population! and then, for the first time in Germany, one sees women with a charm about them: in North Germany one is inclined to wonder that they should ever, the whole sex, have been the occasion of the slightest romance." [Letter to his mother, September 17, 1865, The A.K. Davis-Matthew Arnold Collection, Univ. of Virginia Library, No. 4885, Box 15 (Ms. Kirsch's transcript)].

44. Writing to his sister Fan in December 1877, Arnold once again emphasized the dangers stemming from the powerful influence of the Philistines: "People at the club were talking much about the chances of war, but you know how they talk. That wonderful creature, the British Philistine, has been splashing about during this war [the Near Eastern War between Russia and Turkey] in a way more than worthy of himself. This is what is peculiar to England and what misleads foreigners; there is no country in the world where so much nonsense becomes so public, and so appears to stand for the general voice of the nation, determining its government." (Letter to his sister Fan, Saturday morning, December 1877, Russell, Letters 2:143-144)
Even much of the middle class's reading material, as Arnold declared in "Copyright" (1880), seemed to have been produced for a people with a "low standard of life." Often the books' contents were poor, the design awful, the price expensive, and Arnold readily contrasted all this with the situation in France where the book-trade was generally superior. ("Copyright," Prose Works, 9:126-127). The clear implication was that England's book reading public received the quality of book it deserved. In "The Literary Influence of Academies" he had been very contemptuous of the provinciality of English newspapers: "The French talk of the

BRUTALITÉ DES JOURNAUX ANGLAIS. What strikes them comes from the necessary inherent tendencies of newspaper-writing not being checked in England by any centre of intelligent and urbane spirit, but rather stimulated by coming in contact with a provincial spirit." ("The Literary Influence of Academies," Prose Works 3:249. See also A French Eton, Prose Works 2:316). Years earlier in Schools and Universities on the Continent (1868) the reading habits of the English tradesman class had been contrasted most unfavourably with those of the corresponding class in Germany: "...it is common to meet in Germany with people of the tradesman class who even read (in translations, of course) any important or interesting book that comes out in another country, a book like Macaulay's History of England, for instance; and how unlike this state of culture is to that of the English tradesman, the English reader himself knows very well." (Schools and Universities on the Continent, Prose Works 4:217) However, in "Joubert" Arnold called Macaulay "the great apostle of the Philistines" and in a letter to his sister Fan in July 1876 he had written: "Macaulay is to me uninteresting, mainly, I think, from a dash of intellectual vulgarity which I find in all his performance." ("Joubert," Prose Works 3:210; Letter to his sister Fan, Thursday, July, 1876, Russell, Letters 2:134. For other criticism of English reading habits see "Joseph de Maistre on Russia," Prose Works 9:91).
Further condemnation of the civilisation of the middle class is found in Arnold's essay on Byron, first published in March, 1881, where he described them as "purblind and hideous" and spoke of their two hundred year "intellectual sleep." ("Byron," Prose Works 9:236). In a similar vein, he was reported in The Times of July 30, 1885 to have spoken at the previous day's prize-giving at Dulwich College of "the intellectual poverty and effacement to which in general those classes have, through their own neglect, condemned themselves."(Appendix One, Prose Works 10:257).

45. Letter to his sister Fan, Saturday (December 1877), Russell, Letters 2:141.

46. "The Incompatibles," Prose Works 9:276.

47. In "A Word about America" Arnold described Murdstone and Quinion as "those misgrowths of the English middle-class spirit." ("A Word about America," Prose Works 10:19).

48. "The Incompatibles," Prose Works 9:279-280. In "Literature and Science" (1882) Arnold lamented the great want in the Englishman of symmetry which leads to his deficiencies in architecture and art in general, deficiencies which one day may become clear to him when, with his eyes opened, "he walks the London streets, and he sees such a lesson in meanness as the Strand, for instance, in its true deformity!" ("Literature and Science," Prose Works 10:72). For the Englishman's lack of a good aesthetic appreciation see also "Common Schools Abroad," Prose Works 11:88.

49. "The Incompatibles," Prose Works 9:280.

50. Ibid., p. 249; p. 282; p. 284.

51. Preface to Irish Essays, Prose Works 9:312-313.

52. "A Word about America," Prose Works 10:7. See also Preface to Culture and Anarchy, Prose Works 5:243.

53. "A Word about America," Prose Works 10:10. Arnold had used very similar words criticising the English middle class in "Equality," "Irish Catholicism and British Liberalism," "'Porro Unum Est Necessarium,'" "The Future of Liberalism," "The Incompatibles," "An Unregarded Irish Grievance."

54. "A Word More about America," Prose Works 10:203.

55. Ibid., p. 204. See "The Future of Liberalism," Prose Works 9:148; also "The Nadir of Liberalism," Prose Works 11:56.

56. "A Word More about America," Prose Works 10:204-205. For further criticism of the House of Commons see "The Nadir of Liberalism," Prose Works 11:56; also "Up to Easter," Prose Works 11:205; "Mr. Walter and Schoolmasters' Certificates," Prose Works 2:260-261.

57. "A Word More about America," Prose Works 10:205. See also Preface to the Second Edition of Higher Schools and Universities in Germany, Prose Works 7:128; also "Irish Catholicism and British Liberalism," Prose Works 8:322.

58. "Emerson," Prose Works 10:175-176.

59. Preface to Discourses in America, Prose Works 10:240.

60. "Civilisation in the United States," Prose Works 11:359.

61. Preface to Culture and Anarchy, Prose Works 5:254; "'Ecce, Convertimur ad Gentes,'" Prose Works 9:19.

62. Culture and Anarchy, Prose Works 5:185.

63. St. Paul and Protestantism, Prose Works 6:21.

64. Preface to Culture and Anarchy, Prose Works 5:243.

65. Arnold wrote as follows on September 16, 1870 to Richard Monckton Milnes, first Baron Houghton: "How the Puritan blood you have inherited from your ancestors must leap up at finding that although we in England are embarrassed by having too much Hebraism, our neighbours in France are being ruined by having none at all!" [Letter to Richard Monckton Milnes, September 16, 1870, The A.K. Davis-Matthew Arnold Collection, Univ. of Virginia Library, No. 4885, Box 18 (Ms. Kirsch's transcript)].

66. St. Paul and Protestantism, Prose Works 6:124-125.

67. *Culture and Anarchy*, *Prose Works* 5:187. See also "Isaiah XL-LXVI. Introduction," *Prose Works* 7:72; also Preface to *Last Essays*, *Prose Works* 8:162.

68. *Culture and Anarchy*, *Prose Works* 5:190.

69. Preface to *Culture and Anarchy*, *Prose Works* 5:237.

70. Letter to his mother, June 12, 1869, Russell, *Letters* 2:11.

71. Letter to his mother, June 7, 1870, Ibid., 2:32.

72. *Culture and Anarchy*, *Prose Works* 5:238; "Bishop Butler and the Zeit-Geist," *Prose Works* 8:14. See also *St. Paul and Protestantism*, *Prose Works* 6:7.

73. *A French Eton*, *Prose Works* 2:306; *Culture and Anarchy*, *Prose Works* 5:118; *St. Paul and Protestantism*, *Prose Works* 6:121.

74. Preface to *Culture and Anarchy*, *Prose Works* 5:235-236; "Equality," *Prose Works* 8:295.

75. "A Last Word on the Burials Bill," *Prose Works* 8:96.

76. "Common Schools Abroad," *Prose Works* 11:91.

77. "Disestablishment in Wales," *Prose Works* 11:338.

78. "A Liverpool Address," *Prose Works* 10:87.

79. "A 'Friend of God,'" *Prose Works* 11:185.

80. "Conclusion" to *God and the Bible*, *Prose Works* 7:372.

81. "A Word about America," *Prose Works* 10:11.

82. "A Last Word on the Burials Bill," *Prose Works* 8:97.

83. Letter to his mother, February 27, 1855, Russell, *Letters* 1:42.

84. "The French Play in London," *Prose Works* 9:80.

85. "The Future of Liberalism," *Prose Works* 9:154-155.

86. *A French Eton*, *Prose Works* 2:318.

87. *Culture and Anarchy*, *Prose Works* 5:103.

88. Ibid., p. 129.

89. "Modern Dissent," *St. Paul and Protestantism*, *Prose Works* 6:116.

90. Ibid., pp. 122-123.

91. Literature and Dogma, Prose Works 6:399. In "Disestablishment in Wales" (1888) Arnold spoke of his frequent lament concerning "the narrow aims and the bitter temper of those whom, since they dislike the name of political Dissenters, I will call religious Liberals." ("Disestablishment in Wales," Prose Works 11:334).

92. Preface to God and the Bible, Prose Works 7:384.

93. "Equality," Prose Works 8:294. See also "The French Play in London," Prose Works 9:80.

94. "Equality," Prose Works 8:294. See also "Irish Catholicism and British Liberalism," Prose Works 8:343.

95. "The Political Crisis," letter to the Editor of The Times, May 22, 1886, Prose Works 11:80.

96. Letter to his mother, November 13, 1869, Russell, Letters 2:21.

97. Letter to the Rev. Charles Kegan Paul, November 16, 1869, The A.K. Davis-Matthew Arnold Collection, Univ. of Virginia Library, No. 4885, Box 17 (Ms. Kirsch's transcript).

98 "An Eton Boy," Prose Works 10:25.

99. Preface to the Second Edition of Higher Schools and Universities in Germany, Prose Works 7:93.

100. Ibid., p. 104.

101. Ibid., p. 123. In his essays "Equality" and "A Word More about America" Arnold coupled Dissent with aristocracy as presenting major hindrances to English civilisation and progress: "whereas one of the great obstacles to our civilisation is, as I have often said, British nonconformity, another main obstacle to our civilisation is British aristocracy!" ("Equality," Prose Works 8:304); "The great impediments in our way of progress are aristocracy and Protestant dissent." ("A Word More about America," Prose Works 10:213). In his 1862 article "The Twice-Revised Code" Arnold wrote of the "extreme Dissenters, who for the last ten years have seemed bent on proving how little the future of the country is to owe to their intelligence." ("The Twice-Revised Code," Prose Works 2:243).

102. Preface to the Second Edition of Higher Schools and Universities in Germany, Prose Works 7:128.

103. In Culture and Anarchy Arnold wrote of "the fanaticism of our middle-class Dissenter." [Culture and Anarchy Prose Works 5:136].

104. "Roman Catholics and the State," Letter to the Editor of the Pall Mall Gazette, April 8, 1875, Prose Works 7:136-137.

105. "An Eton Boy," Prose Works 10:45. See also Ibid., pp. 25-26; also Culture and Anarchy, Prose Works 5:102. For praise of Dissent's "negative intellectual action" see Introd. to The Popular Education of France, Prose Works 2:24.

106. "Numbers," Prose Works 10:164.

107. "A Last Word on the Burials Bill," Prose Works 8:109.

108. Preface to the Second Edition of Higher Schools and Universities in Germany, Prose Works 7:127.

109. "Equality," Prose Works 8:291. Arnold over and over preached the virtues of an egalitarian and democratic society. Moreover, he considered that France more than other countries came closest to having these egalitarian and democratic principles in actual practice, and when he wished to discourse on the benefits of equality it was generally to France that he turned to illustrate and confirm his arguments. ["A Word about America," Prose Works 10:1. See also "'Porro Unum Est Necessarium,'" Prose Works 8:363-364. However, as he revealed in his 1886 Special Report for the Education Department, he was also impressed by the general equality of conditions prevailing in Switzerland. (Special Report (1886), Prose Works 11:14)]. This was especially the case with respect to the French working classes. Referring to France in a letter to his mother in 1859 Arnold wrote: "Of one thing I am convinced more and more--of the profoundly democratic spirit which exists among the lower orders, even among the Breton peasants. Not a spirit which will necessarily be turbulent or overthrow the present Government, but a spirit which has irrevocably broken with the past, and which makes the revival of an aristocratic society impossible." (Russell, Letters 1:86-87). He could claim that France was the country "where THE PEOPLE is most alive," meaning by PEOPLE the peasant above all others. ("The Function of Criticism at the Present Time," Prose Works 3:265; "George Sand," Prose Works 8:231). He agreed with George Sand that the peasants were the real people, the foundation of France, and that it was the French Revolution and its egalitarian doctrines which had "made the French peasant." He considered that these peasants, "the largest and strongest element of soundness which the body social of any European nation possesses," had been chiefly responsible for France's great recovery since her recent defeat. ("George Sand," Prose Works 8:231). He also referred with approval in at least four different essays to the thesis of the Belgian political economist M. de Laveleye that though France was more divided up than any other European nation with the exception of Switzerland and Norway she still had her material advantages most widespread, had enjoyed the greatest increase in wealth in recent years, and had her population most within limits for the well-being and advancement of her working class. Arnold had little doubt about the benefits of equality to French prosperity. In these four essays he also quoted the views of Mr. Hamerton who spoke highly of the refinement and civilisation of the French peasant as opposed to those of the English one--"The interval

between him and a Kentish labourer is enormous." ("Equality," Prose Works 8:290; "George Sand," Prose Works 8:232-234; "'Porro Unum Est Necessarium,'" Prose Works 8:361; "'Ecce, Convertimur ad Gentes,'" Prose Works 9:11). What Arnold had himself seen of France made him fully agree with this assessment. He praised the civilisation and egalitarian nature of this country which was responsible for humanising the peasant and for endowing the masses with "well-being, probity, charity, self-respect, tact, and good manners." ("George Sand," Prose Works, 8:234).

110. "Equality," Prose Works 8:299.

111. Ibid., p. 302.

112. Ibid., p. 304. One of Arnold's main purposes in writing "Equality" was to bring attention to what he felt to be the very unsatisfactory nature of the English law of bequest, especially when it was compared with the analogous law of those Continental countries which adopted the provisions of the CODE NAPOLEON. "Switzerland," for example, "is a republic, where the general feeling against inequality is strong....Each Swiss canton has its own law of bequest." (Ibid., p. 281). So, one way that English inequality might be remedied would be through changes in the law of bequest and inheritance. See also "Irish Catholicism and British Liberalism," Prose Works 8:345; also "'Ecce, Convertimur ad Gentes,'" Prose Works 9:7-8.

113. "Irish Catholicism and British Liberalism," Prose Works 8:326, 345.

114. "'Porro Unum Est Necessarium,'" Prose Works 8:363.

115. Ibid., p. 362.

116. Ibid., pp. 363-364.

117. "'Ecce, Convertimur ad Gentes,'" Prose Works 9:8. See also "Wordsworth," Prose Works 9:38; also "The Future of Liberalism," Prose Works 9:158-159.

118. "'Ecce, Convertimur ad Gentes,'" Prose Works 9:11. See also Preface to Mixed Essays, Prose Works 8:371-372.

119. Culture and Anarchy, Prose Works 5:128; Letter to his mother, February 23, 1866, Russell, Letters 1:317.

120. "A Word More about America," Prose Works 10:208; Letter to his mother, June 30, 1866, Russell, Letters 1:334.

121. Culture and Anarchy, Prose Works 5:194; "Irish Catholicism and British Liberalism," Prose Works 8:343. See also Letter to his sister K (Jane Martha), Russell, Letters 2:112; also "The Incompatibles," Prose Works 9:259.

122. "An Eton Boy," Prose Works 10:24.

123. Friendship's Garland, Letter VI, Prose Works 5:69.

124. Letter to M.E. Grant Duff, M.P., September 9, 1868, Russell, Letters 1:397.

125. "After the Elections," Prose Works 11:86-87; "The Zenith of Conservatism," Prose Works 11:131.

126. Letter to his sister K (Jane Martha), February 1874, Russell Letters 2:112.

127. "The Zenith of Conservatism," Prose Works 11:129. See also Culture and Anarchy, Prose Works 5:128.

128. Letter to M.E. Grant Duff, M.P., Christmas Day, 1872, Russell, Letters, 2:91.

129. Culture and Anarchy, Prose Works 5:194-195.

130. "Irish Catholicism and British Liberalism," Prose Works 8:327-328. See also "Up to Easter," Prose Works 11:202.

131. Letter to his sister K (Jane Martha), April 2, 1880, Russell, Letters 2:167.

132. Letter to his sister Fan, March 20, 1886, Ibid., 2:325.

133. "The Future of Liberalism," Prose Works 9:152.

134. Friendship's Garland, Letter II, Prose Works 5:46.

135. "Equality," Prose Works 8:304.

136. "The Future of Liberalism," Prose Works 9:153.

137. Ibid., p. 155. "Still, our civilisation is not really advanced by any such measure as the Burials Bill; in so far as readings from Eliza Cook are encouraged to produce themselves in public, and to pass themselves off as equivalent to readings from Milton, it is retarded." (Ibid., p. 157). See also "A Last Word on the Burials Bill," Prose Works 8:87-110.

138. Culture and Anarchy, Prose Works 5:221.

139. "The Future of Liberalism," Prose Works 9:155.

140. Ibid., p. 154.

141. "The Nadir of Liberalism," Prose Works 11:54.

142. Ibid., p. 76.

143. "Irish Catholicism and British Liberalism," Prose Works 8:327. See also "The Incompatibles," Prose Works 9:273.

144. "The Nadir of Liberalism," Prose Works 11:76. See also "The Future of Liberalism," Prose Works 9:138; also "The Zenith of Conservatism," Prose Works 11:143.

145. "The Nadir of Liberalism," Prose Works 11:64.

146. Ibid., p. 76.

147. "The Incompatibles," Prose Works 9:282.

148. Letter to his wife, Sunday, October 1854, Russell, Letters 1:39.

149. On the Study of Celtic Literature, Prose Works 3:348.

150. "Irish Catholicism and British Liberalism," Prose Works 8:346-347. Arnold was convinced that in their present state they were not fit to rule the country: "The middle classes cannot assume rule as they are at present,--it is impossible. And yet in the rule of this immense class, this class with so many correspondences, communications, and openings into the lower class, lies our future. There I agree with Mr. Bright. But our middle class, as it is at present, CANNOT take the lead which belongs to it. It has not the qualifications. Seriousness it has, the better part of it; it may even be said to have sacrificed everything to seriousness. And of the seriousness and of the sense for conduct in this nation, which are an invaluable treasure to it, and a treasure most dangerously wanting elsewhere, the middle classes are the stronghold. But they have lived in a narrow world of their own, without openness and flexibility of mind, without any notion of the variety of powers and possibilities in human life. They know neither man nor the world; and on all the arduous questions presenting themselves to our age,--political questions, social questions, the labour question, the religious question,--they have at present no light, and can give none. I say, then, they CANNOT fill their right place as they are now; but you, and I, and every man in this country, are interested in their being able to fill it." ("'Ecce, Convertimur ad Gentes,'" Prose Works 9:17). Before assuming rule they had to be transformed, a call made very frequently by Arnold in his writings. See for example: A French Eton, Prose Works 2:312; "Equality," Prose Works 8:298; Preface to Discourses in America, Prose Works 10:240. Sometimes he contended that the English in general, and not just the middle class, be changed, as in On the Study of Celtic Literature, Prose Works 3:394.

151. A French Eton, Prose Works 2:322.

152. Ibid., p. 324. See also letter to his mother, Feb. 2, 1864, Russell, Letters 1:224; "Schools in the Reign of Queen Victoria," Prose Works 11:245.

CHAPTER FIVE

ARNOLD ON THE INADEQUACIES OF MIDDLE CLASS EDUCATION IN ENGLAND

A) "Our middle classes are nearly the worst educated in the world."

That Arnold thought little of his country's middle class education, and more specifically of its secondary schools, is patent not only from his educational but also from many other of his diverse writings. Why he was contemptuous of this level of education and why he considered that the institution of a public educational system was essential for transforming the middle classes will be the main concerns in this chapter. His job as a H.M.I. was concerned with the inspection of those elementary schools which were receiving a limited source of finance from the State. As no secondary school was under State control it was naturally outside of his province to inspect such private establishments. However, years of travel throughout England unavoidably brought him into limited but definite contact with a number of these schools and perhaps more often with some of their proprietors. In addition, he certainly had opportunity to study at first-hand foreign secondary schools while engaged on his official work for both the Newcastle and Taunton Commissions. A French Eton (1864), the unofficial study emanating from his work for the former Commission, and Schools and Universities on the Continent (1868), his own edition of the official report for the latter Commission, are a mine of information not only about foreign secondary education but also of English secondary establishments which were often contrasted with their Continental counterparts. Some mention was also made in his report for the Newcastle Commission itself, later published as The Popular

Education of France (1861), of both foreign and domestic middle class education. But Arnold's treatment of England's secondary schools and their merits and demerits vis-à-vis those on the Continent were not confined to his official reports. Abundant comparative educational references were also made in very many of his heterogeneous writings, an obvious indication of the importance in which he held this topic.

With the exception of the great Public Schools and a very small number of other institutions Arnold had little but contempt for England's existing secondary educational provision. In the article "'Porro Unum Est Necessarium,'" published in the November, 1878 issue of the Fortnightly Review, mindful of a recent report on the state of contemporary French secondary education, he considered the importance of middle class educational provision to a nation's well-being:

> Yes, the schools for this class are indeed, as the French themselves say, the keystone of a country's whole system of public instruction: they are what fixes and maintains the intellectual level of a people. And in our country they have been left to come forth as they could and to form themselves at haphazard, and are now, as a whole, in the most serious degree inadequate and unsatisfactory. For some twenty years I have been full of this thought, and have striven to make the British public share it with me; but quite vainly. [1]

In fact, his criticism of England's middle class education and his repeated demands that it be made a public concern was one of the most dominant leitmotivs of his thought. Moreover, he himself acknowledged in later years that his copious writings on this subject had taken on a somewhat hackneyed character to many of his readers. He imagined people saying: "THERE! HE HAS GOT ON HIS OLD HOBBY AGAIN!" [2] or "'It is becoming a mania with him ... he has schools on the brain.'"[3] In

January 1879 he wrote to his daughter that though receiving praise for his efforts he would still like others to take up cudgels on behalf of middle class education:

> And Maine and Lecky both said to me, only yesterday, that the work I was doing by forcing the question of middle-class education and civilisation upon people's thoughts was invaluable, and that they were heartily with me. But I want other people to talk about the matter rather than to talk about it myself, for fear of its getting to pass for a hobby of mine. [4]

He admitted in his 1882 "A Liverpool Address" that he had "harped a good deal" on this theme and he expressed a wish that he could change his customary phrases and adopt some different practical suggestion for his usual one of State educational provision for the middle classes, but he feared "there is no chance of this happening. What has been the burden of my song hitherto, will probably have, so far as I can at present see, to be the burden of it till the end."[5] For Arnold never waivered from his steadfast conviction that the members of England's middle classes, with very few exceptions, suffered their children to be educated in abysmal schools. He often put this belief in sharp focus by contrasting England's secondary schools with those of other European nations. For example, in "My Countrymen" (1866) he had imaginary foreigners declare that the English middle classes were educated in the worst schools of the nation, while their own middle classes were educated in their countries' best institutions.[6] He even contrasted England's middle class schools at a more global level. In The Popular Education of France (1861), after acknowledging his agreement with Tallyrand's guarded praise of England's traditional Public Schools, he declared

> By allowing it all its merits, how small a portion

> of the population does it embrace! It embraces the aristocratic class; it embraces the higher professional class; it embraces a few of the richest and most successful of the commercial class; of the great body of the commercial class and of the immense middle classes of this country, it embraces not one. They are left to an education which, though among its professors are many excellent and honourable men, is deplorable. Our middle classes are nearly the worst educated in the world. [7]

This last sentence is a particularly strong indictment of England's secondary education but it is a sentiment which occurred frequently in Arnold's writings. Moreover, if England's middle class were among the world's worst educated, Arnold seemed to consider, if he himself believed the words which he put in the mouth of his fictional friend Arminius in Friendship's Garland (1871), that the best educated in the world were to be found in Prussia.[8] Admittedly, he usually castigated the education of the middle classes in a general European context. For example, in his 1874 article "A Speech at Westminster" he condemned his country's middle class schools as "probably the worst in Europe."[9] Similarly, in "'Porro Unum Est Necessarium'" (1878) he wrote that England's "body of secondary schools is suffered to remain the most imperfect and unserviceable in civilised Europe."[10] Again, in his 1879 lecture "'Ecce, Convertimur ad Gentes'" he dismissed these schools with the cry that they were, "both socially and intellectually, the most inadequate that fall to the lot of any middle class among the civilised nations of Europe."[11] In the following year he again widened the geographical area in which he censured these middle class schools castigating them as being "the worst of the kind anywhere."[12] Narrowing his focus of criticism almost a year later in his article "An Unregarded Irish Grievance" (1881) he was content to categorise the middle class of both England and Ireland as being "the worst schooled middle class in Western Europe."[13]

But why exactly did Arnold hold the secondary educational provision in England to be so poor and defective and to lag so far behind that of Continental nations? In answer, in the following section are considered briefly some of the most prominent reasons which he adduced for this sorry condition, namely, the complacent attitude and satisfaction of the English towards the existing institutions, the inadequate supply of good schools, the absence of any proper control and securities, the neglect of "science" and lack of standardisation of curricula and texts, the poor quality of teachers, the fostering of the separation of classes by the existing system. Then follows a short discussion--it is necessarily short as he himself wrote comparatively little on this topic--of what Arnold found wrong with his country's third level education of which the middle classes were partaking more and more as the years passed.

B) Arnold on the Defects of England's Secondary Education

i) Satisfaction of the English with the Existing Provision

A paramount difficulty with English middle class education, in Arnold's eyes, resided in the fact that not only was it quite inferior to that available on the Continent but, as important, the middle classes themselves were quite oblivious to this inferiority and were satisfied with the present arrangement. In fact, in the preface to Schools and Universities on the Continent (1868) he remarked that the middle classes were not really very interested in the subject of their own education, though they were greatly concerned for popular schooling.[14] The great majority of the members of these classes were unwavering in their belief that the existing provision of private schools was all that was needed, giving credence to Arnold's belief expressed in "'Porro Unum Est Necessarium'" (1868): "A satisfactory system of public secondary schools nobody calls for."[15] Representative of this attitude, which he felt to be very pervasive, were individuals such as Thomas Bazley, M.P. whose speech to his constituents at Manchester, as quoted in the Times of December 1, 1864, Arnold copied into his note-book for 1864, and again into that of the following year:

> During the last few months there has been a cry that middle-class education ought to receive more attention. He confessed himself very much alarmed by the clamour that was raised. He did not think that class need excite the sympathy either of the Legislature or the public. The middle class had the means of paying for their education, and, as a body, he believed that they were obtaining the best education of the kind for their children. [16]

Arnold also referred to Bazley's speech in "My Countrymen" (1866) and Culture and Anarchy (1869), declaring ironically in the latter work that "this satisfaction of our middle-class member of Parliament with the mental state of the middle class was truly representative, and makes good his claim to stand for the beautiful and virtuous mean of that class."[17] This was the sort of self-satisfaction and complacency, felt to be largely unjustified by Arnold, which he spent much of his life attacking. A couple of months after the publication of Schools and Universities on the Continent (1868) he wrote in the Pall Mall Gazette a review of Heinrich von Sybel's pamphlet "Die Deutschen Und Die Auswärtigen Universitaten" in which he criticised the neglect shown to England's secondary schools. A German humanist, Arnold remarked:

> would be astounded, so must every well-informed man be astounded, to see that the notions of English school reformers seem also limited to an eternal canvassing of the merits and demerits of our half-dozen best schools, and our five thousand luckiest schoolboys, while the condition of the unhappy mass of our secondary schools, to which a French LYCEE is almost what Heidelberg or Berlin are to Mr. Spurgeon's new Baptist College, can hardly win from us more than a passing notice. [18]

Again, years later in 1881, mindful of the situation in both Ireland and England, Arnold referred to middle class complacency with respect to the educational status quo in the following terms:

> No, the great English middle-class public is at present by no means bent seriously on making education efficient all round. It prefers its routine and its claptrap to even its own education. It is and must be free to do so if it likes. We who lament its doing so, we who see what it loses by doing so, we can only resolve not to be dupes of its claptrap ourselves, and not to help in duping others with it, but to work with patience and perseverance for the evocation of that better spirit which will surely arise in this great class at last.[19]

However, he was realistic enough to understand that it would be a mammoth task to persuade his compatriots that it was now time to abandon this satisfaction with the status quo and look to what many of them regarded with aversion, and what he himself, impressed by what he had seen on the Continent, considered to constitute the main agency for ensuring England's future, namely increased intervention of the State in the secondary educational sphere.

ii) Inadequate Supply of Good Secondary Schools

Any individual or group of individuals were free to establish a secondary school and Arnold was well aware that some respectable persons did have their own competent establishments. As he wrote in a letter to the Pall Mall Gazette of October 5, 1870 referring to the Report of the Taunton Commission: "some middle-class schools are managed, if the report of the Commissioners be true, by ignorant charlatans, while others deserve the highest possible character; and a year's residence at one may thus have a totally different value from a year's residence at another."[20] However, he was quite assured that the majority of England's secondary school proprietors had little moral or professional aptitude for this period of endeavour. The sort of schools which he found particularly blameworthy were those which he castigated in A French Eton (1864), namely those which advertised their wares in the Times. He was most ironic in his comments on a number of these advertisements which promised so much but provided so little. He quoted the following example: "'Education, 20L. per annum, no extras. Diet unlimited, ~~and~~ of the best description. The education comprises Greek, Latin, and German, French by a resident native, mathematics, algebra, mapping, globes, and all the essentials of a first-rate commercial education.'" Thus everything connected with the children's lives, "Physical, moral, mental, and spiritual," would, Arnold remarked with sarcasm, be ministered to.[21] Often the advertisements related to Educational Homes which sought to emulate a home environment while at the same time providing school-training. Many schools promised to cater to the special needs of difficult children and to render them more tractable. Indeed, whatever type of school the public wanted for its children its provision would be undertaken by some private individual.

Though Arnold provided detailed descriptions of a number of Continental secondary schools, both public and private, he did not furnish any account of an existing English school at this level. Usually he kept his observations on English establishments couched in general terms and avoided discussion of any specific individual school. However, he did provide in the sixth letter of Friendship's Garland (1871) an account of an imaginary secondary school in Peckham which besides revealing his famed wit and "vivacity" at their ironic best also illustrated the sort of establishment which he particularly despised. This was the school which had been attended by that caricature of England's self-made Philistine class, the Radical Mr. Bottles, whom we have encountered earlier. Arnold's depiction of Bottle's education is worth quoting in full:

> Mr. Bottles was brought up at the Lycurgus House Academy, Peckham. You are not to suppose from the name of Lycurgus that any Latin and Greek was taught in the establishment; the name only indicates the moral discipline, and the strenuous earnest character, imparted there. As to the instruction, the thoughtful educator who was principal of the Lycurgus House Academy,--Archimedes Silverpump, Ph.D., you must have heard of him in Germany?--had modern views. 'We must be men of our age,' he used to say. 'Useful knowledge, living languages, and the forming of the mind through observation and experiment, these are the fundamental articles of my educational creed.' Or, as I have heard his pupil Bottles put it in his expansive moments after dinner (Bottles used to ask me to dinner till that affair of yours with him in the Reigate train): 'Original man, Silverpump! fine mind! fine system! None of your antiquated rubbish--all practical work--latest discoveries in science--mind constantly kept excited--lots of interesting experiments--lights of all colours--fizz! fizz! bang! bang! That's what I call forming a man'.[22]

Arminius, pictured by Arnold as the stereotypical Prussian who considered all practices of another's country to be necessarily inferior to his own, was represented, it need hardly be stated, as being little impressed with this paragon of the English middle class educational system.

Another imaginary private secondary school of the type Arnold found especially anathema was described in Dickens' David Copperfield. In a letter to J. G. Fitch, dated October 14, 1880 Arnold wrote that he had "this year been reading David Copperfield for the first time. Mr. Creakle's school at Blackheath is the type of our ordinary middle class schools, and our middle class is satisfied that so it should be."[23] He was clearly impressed by Dickens' novel which epitomised, in his mind, the patent inadequacies of such schools, as well as the Philistine character of this wider class itself, and while he hoped, as he wrote in "The Incompatibles" published in the Nineteenth Century in April and June, 1881, that the real life Mr. Creakle and Salem House would "perish," he considered that Dickens' representations were "immortal."[24] Though this novel was written in 1849-50 Arnold maintained in this article that the picture painted by Dickens was still by and large a fair representation of much of the contemporary secondary educational scene thirty years later. In support of this assertion, Arnold, as was his wont, turned to the Continent for evidence, adducing a book by Baring Gould about Germany in which were discussed the public schools of that country. Gould, according to Arnold, wrote that the products of these schools who came to English private secondary schools as language teachers and ushers very often reported that they had come across establishments and principals of the type painted by Dickens. The result was astonishment and disgust. These Germans "cannot understand how such things can be, and how a great and well-to-do class can be content with such an ignoble bringing up. But so things are, and they report their experience of them, and their experience brings before us, over and over again, Mr. Creakle and Salem House."[25]

Arnold even used David Copperfield to help him define what he meant by "middle class." He agreed that it was difficult to set the limits to this class, for "middle class" could mean different things to different people. Accordingly, by "middle class" he understood those people who had been educated at schools "which are more or less like Salem House, and by educators who are more or less like Mr. Creakle." For he insisted that the great majority of that group occupying the middle position between the manual workers and the upper class were brought up at such establishments, the result being a manifest inferiority in their education and civilisation.[26] Though he admitted that there also existed a small number of good schools with competent teachers and that even establishments on the Salem House model produced individuals who were not permanently scarred by their egregious treatment he was still assured that "on the mass, the training produces with fatal sureness the effect of lowering their standard of life and impairing their civilisation. It helps to produce in them, and it perpetuates, a defective type of religion, a narrow range of intellect and knowledge, a stunted sense of beauty, a low standard of manners."[27] He also employed similar language for his critical comments in "'Porro Unum Est

Necessarium'" (1878) on narrowly focused schools for minority groups:

> Schools for the licensed victuallers, schools for the commercial travellers, schools for the Wesleyans, schools for the Quakers,--to educate a middle class in this way is to doom it to grow up on an inferior plane, with the claims of intellect and knowledge not satisfied, the claim of beauty not satisfied, the claim of manners not satisfied.[28]

But if it is true that Arnold was contemptuous of the vast majority of England's secondary educational institutions it should also be stated that he was quite satisfied, as shall be shown in more detail in the following chapter, with the great Public Schools. For example, in the Introduction to The Popular Education of France (1861) he had written:

> The aristocratic classes in England may, perhaps, be well content to rest satisfied with their Eton and Harrow. The State is not likely to do better for them. Nay, the superior confidence, spirit, and style, engendered by a training in the great public schools, constitute for these classes a real privilege, a real engine of command, which they might, if they were selfish, be sorry to lose by the establishment of schools great enough to beget a like spirit in the classes below them. [29]

Again, in the Conclusion to Schools and Universities on the Continent (1868) the schools of England's upper classes were praised while those of the middle classes were as usual dismissed contemptuously: "Of course, what good instruction there is, and what schools of good standing there are to get it in, fall chiefly to the lot of the upper class. It is on the middle class that the inconvenience, such as it is, of getting indifferent instruction, or getting it in schools of indifferent standing, mainly comes." Moreover, from the viewpoint of the comparative educator he could say, "This inconvenience...strikes one after seeing attentively the schools of the Continent."[30]

However, though Continental middle class schools were generally better than their counterparts in England, he believed that the Public Schools, as he declared in A French Eton (1864), turned out a product better than that of the Toulouse Lyceum or of the Sorèze College in France. He agreed with those who maintained that "'Your French Etons are no Etons at all; there is nothing like an Eton in France.'" But schools like Eton in England amounted to "only some five or six" and they could obviously only produce a tiny number of well-educated boys. Moreover, their costs were prohibitive and far beyond the reach of most of the middle class. However, he continued, in France there were very many excellent and relatively cheap schools and while no schools were able to attain the high standards of the few English Public Schools, overall school provision for these middle classes was far superior to that found in England. For Arnold insisted that in England there was a very large gap between the education provided by the few schools such as Eton, Harrow, Rugby, and Winchester and that of the multitude of inferior establishments catering to the burgeoning middle classes, hardly any of which reached the standards of the schools at Toulouse or Sorèze.[31] In addition, while the French Lyceum might not attain the same high standards as a great English Public School, did "it not gain if compared with the 'Classical and Commercial Academy?'"[32] Arnold returned to this general topic years later in 1881 in "An Unregarded Irish Grievance." He wrote that nothing but advantage could accrue to an Irish lad being educated at one of the great Public Schools in England, but the fact remained that only a small minority of the Irish, and of the English, middle class could afford these schools. However, the situation was different in France where the middle class had the *lycées* to which they could send their sons. For example, M. Gambetta, remarked Arnold, the son of a tradesman at Cahors was educated in the *lycée* of that town--"a school not so delightful and historic as Eton, certainly, but with a status as honourable as that of Eton, and with a teaching on the whole as good." But in both England and Ireland the sons of tradesmen were educated "in the worst and most ignoble secondary schools in Western Europe."[33] Moreover, if the middle classes found it difficult to send their sons to the small number of good secondary establishments because of financial constraints, so much more did the working classes for the vast majority of whose children secondary education was out of the question. In fact, to compensate for this failure to attend the secondary level the School Boards after 1870 were tending to introduce what Arnold considered to be too ambitious programmes into the elementary schools and that is why he presented the following argument in his 1879 address to the Ipswich Working Men's College: "Discourage, then the School Boards in their attempts to make the elementary school what it cannot well be; but make them join with you in calling for public secondary schools, which will accomplish properly what they are aiming at."[34]

Of course, as Arnold admitted in *A French Eton* (1864), Eton and the "educational home" were two opposing extremes and there were many schools of varying worth in between, some of which were cheaper than Eton and offering similar moral securities, for example Cheltenham, Bradfield, Marlborough. However, they were few and scattered here anad there throughout the country. Similarly, nearly a quarter of a century later in his 1887 "Schools in the Reign of Queen Victoria" he again praised the great Public Schools as well as a small number of other institutions of sound character. But he still stressed that they amounted to very few:

> The spirit in which many a chief teacher, and many and many an assistant teacher, have striven to do their duty in our great public schools during the last forty years, and not in our oldest and greatest schools only, but also in schools such as Clifton, the City of London, Repton, Uppingham, cannot be too highly honoured, or the good done by such labours be too highly prized. Still, the schools in question must all be regarded as points, more or less bright, emergent from a general darkness. Unillumined, around and beyond them, lay chaos; and unillumined, after the report of the Clarendon Commission, it still continued to be.[35]

Moreover, though there were some good schools Arnold in A French Eton (1864) asserted that there was no way under the present system to establish a sufficient number of them where their need was greatest. But the case was different in France where a much greater number of good schools were generously located in all localities. Another problem was that this small number of good English schools were no longer cheap; the tendency was for them to increase their charges as they gained in excellence. This was the case with Marlborough which, he declared, was perhaps still the cheapest of these schools.[36] But as he wrote to Macmillan on February, 16, 1864, referring to Dr. Bradley, Headmaster of Marlborough: "My point is, that Marlborough, having succeeded, puts on a fee which virtually excludes the real middle class. His point is, that it put on this, not because it had succeeded, but because it was obliged to, the old fee not being remunerative. But it is Marlborough's success which enables it to GET THIS HIGHER FEE PAID, and it is a fee which excludes the real middle class."[37] But the position was different in France where schools like the Toulouse

Lyceum kept their charges moderate even though their excellence increased. The reason for this, Arnold was convinced, stemmed primarily from the pervasive role of the State in France's secondary education. The cheapness of the Toulouse Lyceum was due to the fact that it

> is a public institution, administered in view of the general educational wants of France, and not of its own individual preponderance.[38] And what makes (or made, alas!) the school-charge of the Sorèze College remain moderate, even with a most distinguished and attractive director, like Lacordaire, at its head? It was the organisation of a complete system of secondary schools throughout France, the abundant supply of institutions, with at once respectable guarantees and reasonable charges, fixing a general mean of school-cost which even the most successful private school cannot venture much to exceed. [39]

iii) Lack of any Control and Securities in England's Secondary Schools

Thus it is manifest that in Arnold's opinion, there was an insufficient supply of good educational establishments for the middle classes in England.[40] Furthermore, the dominant reason why he was contemptuous of the existing schools--and it was a reason with which he had been particularly impressed by his comparative educational investigations on the Continent-- was because they were private and under hardly any State control, with no authority higher than private individuals; in a letter to his mother in 1864 he wrote of "the present entire independence of middle class education."[41] As the century progressed he saw the gradual expansion of the role of the State in the elementary sphere and though he rarely abated from criticism of certain aspects of this level he came to acknowledge that England's elementary schools with increased supervision and security ensured by the State would have an optimistic future. Even as early as A French Eton (1864) he could relate that the English "called upon State-aid, with the securities accompanying this, to give us elementary schools more like what they should be; we have thus founded in elementary education a system still, indeed, far from perfect, but living and fruitful--a system which will probably survive the most strenuous efforts for its destruction."[42] However, he never arrived at a state of confidence regarding secondary education, for State control over schools at this level only commenced after his death. Moreover, he had little belief that the Government had any intrinsic interest in public education. As he argued in "'Ecce, Convertimur ad Gentes,'" (1879) even in the realm of elementary education Government action came with some reluctance; the State moved as late, as slowly, and as inoffensively as possible: "instead of stimulating public opinion to give it additional powers, it has confined itself to cautiously accepting and discharging the functions which public opinion has insisted on laying upon it." Furthermore, he contended that such a state of affairs would continue, for if the Government increased its role in the educational sphere it would not be due to its own initiative, but, on the contrary, it would be because it had been obliged to do so by public opinion. Accordingly, "if I speak of the desirableness of extending to a further class of schools the action of the State, it is well understood that I am not, as in bureaucratic Prussia I might be, revealing the secret aims and ambitions of the Education Department. All the aims of that Department have been clearly manifested to be the other way."[43] To boot, he had little conviction that English public opinion would in the near future pressure the Government to increase its role in public education for the middle class.

Of course, Arnold saw it as one of his most important roles to persuade public opinion of the need for increased State involvement in many spheres, and especially that of middle class education, and though, as we have seen, he himself took hardly any direct practical political action to convert the public to his point of view, his very large literary output had this persuasion as one of its main goals. He was convinced that public opinion must first demand State action and that only then would politicians hearken to the need--the converse would not happen. This is why he earnestly desired as much press coverage of the education question as possible. Thus, in a letter to Thomas Humphry Ward of October 26, 1878 he wrote:

> Look at the enclosed, which I should like returned; and consider whether you could not take the opportunity given by Playfair's very insufficient Bill to do something for the cause of public secondary instruction in England. I don't mean in the Academy, but in the Saturday Review. The Saturday has very considerable scholastic influence, and its help would be valuable in that ground, as well as on the more general ground of the Review's circulation among educated people. You will read my article in the Fortnightly, I hope, next week; I was moved to write it by Bardsure's report, and I should like to see the question of public secondary instruction fairly launched, which it can only be through the press, for politicians will not seriously touch it until the press has made it more actual than it is at present.

Four days later he again wrote to Ward:

> The public will not attend to details on educational questions, and to discuss Playfair's bill in detail might interest schoolmasters, but is not what I want. I want to get the public's attention drawn to a crying want--the want of public secondary schools. To found a system of such schools would be a democratic revolution; Beresford Hope, therefore, will never let the S.R. lend

> itself seriously and persistently to the advocacy of such a thing. The S.R. never said a word about either of my foreign reports; it has been, and it probably will remain, perfectly useless so far as the institution of a new and better system of secondary schools is concerned. But it might be brought at least to notice, a propos of my summary of Bardsure's report, the crying wants and impotence of our present system; and as it has great scholastic circulation and influence, its merely doing this would be a gain to reformers.[44]

In fact, throughout his life middle class schools in England remained in private hands loyal, as he held, to the pervasive doctrine favoured by the Nonconformist Philistine of independence from State authority, of laissez faire enterprise, and "Self-Help." These were the sort of people who had the favourite maxim that by sending their children to private schools they were "acting in the spirit of self-respect and independence."[45] Of course, as we have seen in Chapter III, he was quite cognizant of the antipathy of his countrymen to excessive State intervention, particularly in education, and of their loathing for any form of despotism. Indeed, he wrote in A French Eton (1864) of the common criticism that there was a despotic (i.e. Napoleonic) government in France and that the lycées were a constituent part of it. But his counter-argument was, leaving aside the question of France's despotism, that "Switzerland is not a despotically-governed country, and it has its Lyceums just as much as France."[46] It is clear that his call for increased State intervention in the secondary educational sphere was far removed from any desire to introduce any form of despotism. On the contrary, he consistently asserted that the predominant reason for having State-run secondary schools, such as the Continental lycées, was not that they would act as vehicles for any form of despotism, be it intellectual, social, or political, but, on the contrary, that they would be agencies for effecting a true liberalism with all this notion's ennobling civilisation.

At any rate, the inadequacies of the existing secondary educational provision being blatant in Arnold's eyes it was now essential that the State intervene in this sphere. As he wrote in the Introduction to The Popular Education of France (1861): "But the middle classes in England have every reason not to rest content with their private schools; the State can do a great deal better for them."[47] Of course, it must be reiterated, this was a conviction which had been strongly reinforced by what he had witnessed in the educational sphere on the Continent. Years later in 1882, referring back to his official work abroad for the Taunton Commission in 1865, he indicated how he had been impressed by the State organisation of higher education in countries like Germany and how he had come to the conclusion that a similar organisation would benefit the English middle classes greatly:

> When I came back from the Continent, after seeing the provision of schools both secondary and higher for the middle classes in a country like Germany, I looked attentively at the sort of provision made in England, and it naturally occurred to me that the State might, to the great benefit of the middle classes, organise secondary and higher education here, as it has organised it abroad. The difficulty of duly proportioning and co-ordering the supply of schools according to the need, can hardly, perhaps, be got over without legislative organisation. [48]

Similarly, in a review article of 1868, "German and English Universities," Arnold stressed his favourable impressions of the State provision of secondary and superior education on the Continent but particularly that of Germany. In that country, "as in France, the quantity of service rendered to the nation by its public establishments of secondary and superior instruction may well fix an Englishman's attention." In addition, its quality offered "much that is new to us, much that is the best of its kind in Europe, and either unique, or the model of whatever is best of the same elsewhere; much, therefore, from which we may get valuable suggestions for our own use."[49] Arnold was even impressed during his tour for the Taunton Commission with the role of the State in Italy, though, as we have seen in Chapter II, he recognised that major problems pervaded the educational system in that country. Still, the Italian State, under the Minister of Public Instruction, had "the supreme duty of seeing that the whole concern of national education is properly and efficiently worked."[50] But without State involvement English secondary education would remain in its totally unsatisfactory condition. As he declared quite categorically in The Popular Education of France (1861), with his mind full of the great benefits a State secondary system had bestowed on the French middle class, the education of the corresponding class in England must either "remain what it is, vulgar and unsound; or the state must create by its authorisation, its aid--above all, by its inspection--institutions honourable because of their public character, and cheap because nationally frequented, in which they may receive a better."[51] For it was clear, as he wrote in "An Unregarded Irish Grievance" (1881), that which John Pentland Mahaffy found blameworthy in Irish education was for Arnold himself "our signal deficiency in England also, the want of all general organisation of the service of secondary instruction, of all coordination of the existing resources scattered over the country."[52] But not only were organisation and coordination lacking among England's plenteous private schools, such schools also failed to enjoy any adequate guarantees; this was unlike the situation in countries such as France and Prussia where the State exercised certain controls over private schools thereby ensuring their well-being.

Arnold had discussed the relative merits of guarantees provided by public and private schools in the conclusion to Schools and Universities on the Continent (1868):

> From the moment you seriously desire to have your schools efficient, the question between public and private schools is settled. Of public schools you can take guarantees, of private schools you cannot. Guarantees cannot be absolutely certain. It is possible for a private school, which has given no guarantees to be good; it is possible for a public school, which has given guarantees to be bad. But even in England the disbelief in human reason is hardly strong enough to make us seriously contend that a rational being cannot frame for a known purpose guarantees which give him, at any rate, more numerous chances of reaching that purpose than he would have without them. [53]

It was in this regard that Arnold on a number of occasions poured scorn on secondary schools set up by such groups as the Licensed Victuallers or the Commercial Travellers. He was not merely being snobbish here, though he did write in Culture and Anarchy (1869) that it was unwise to have distinct schools for the children of such groups, for then not only will their domestic but their school education also be conducted "in a kind of odour of licensed victualism or of bagmanism."[54] Rather, he just could not imagine how such people could provide the proper supervision, securities, guarantees, guidance and general pedagogical expertise requisite for good secondary schooling. However, he contrasted this situation with that which he found existing in Prussia where the best schools were those under Crown patronage which the Sovereign himself founded, endowed and directly controlled or had his own representatives controlling "to serve as types of what schools should be." The Sovereign or his representatives, declared Arnold, were obviously in a much better position than private founders, like the licensed victuallers or commercial travellers in England, to control and manage schools for they were removed from prejudices and pettinesses, had a greater means and influence, and better access to good advice from experts like Wilhelm Von Humboldt or F. E. D. Schleiermacher. "This," asserted Arnold, "is what, in North Germany, the governors do in the matter of education for the governed; and one may say that they thus give the governed a lesson, and draw out in them the idea of a right reason higher than the suggestions of an ordinary man's ordinary self."[55] In other words, these Crown Patronage schools in North Germany came under the aegis of State control and thereby were furnished with greater guarantees than could be provided by any private individual or group. But in England the action of the governors consisted in a member of the Royalty or an important minister going to the opening of a school of the licensed victuallers or commercial travellers and lauding these people's energy and self-reliance with little thought being given to the notion that the children's education should be carried out in a very different manner.[56] Furthermore, there existed no real securities guaranteeing the schools' well-being.

Arnold found occasion to relate in several of his writings that he found the disparity in numbers educated at schools which offered some guarantees of security and supervision in his own country and in others on the Continent to be especially problematic from England's point of view. Earlier, in Chapter II, there was mentioned his complaint as set forth in his 1868 Schools and Universities on the Continent that many fewer English boys enjoyed satisfactory education in the nine prominent Public Schools and the chief endowed grammar schools than in the public higher schools of either France or Prussia.[57] But he also argued that when account was taken of private schools completely free from any guarantees of securities and supervision the disparity in numbers receiving satisfactory education was much greater. Accordingly, though a good education, he believed, was generally received by the comparative few who attended the great Public Schools and chief endowed grammars the multitude of the middle class attending other private establishments often received an education which was lax, far from satisfactory, and lacking in any guarantees of well-being. Ten years after Schools and Universities on the Continent (1868) Arnold in "'Porro Unum Est Necessarium'" (1878) reiterated his argument regarding the differences in numbers of the middle classes receiving a satisfactory education in his own country and elsewhere, this time contrasting the situation prevailing in Great Britain as a whole and that of France. For the middle-class Englishman, declared Arnold

> the point to be seized and set in clear light, and again and again to be insisted upon until seized and set in clear light it is, is this: that while we have not more than 20,000 boys in Great Britain and Ireland receiving a secondary instruction which can in any possible sense be said to offer guarantees for its efficiency, France has 79,231 boys receiving secondary instruction in inspected public schools, and 78,065 more who are receiving it in schools giving public guarantees for their efficiency. It is this: that whereas in England the middle class is brought up on the second plane, in France the middle class is brought up on the first plane. [58]

This stress on the necessity of schools being obliged to furnish guarantees for their efficiency recurred again and again in Arnold's writings, such guarantees, of course, being provided by the State. As he declared in A French Eton (1864), those private schools which advertised their wares in The Times would never make good their claims nor could provide "an education comparable to that given by the Toulouse and Sorèze schools," the reason being that the English schools, unlike the French ones, "want the securities which, to make them produce even half of what they offer, are indispensable--the securities of supervision and publicity." But on the Continent, he continued, schools though not offering the securities of publicity to the same degree as the small number of English Public Schools such as Eton or Harrow, nevertheless "offer, in far larger measure, the other security--the security of competent supervision. With them this supervision is not occasional and extraordinary, but periodic and regular; it is not explorative only; it is also, to a considerable extent, authoritative."[59] In short, it was this Continental-type State control which was required for secondary education in England, a control which would provide the middle classes with "RESPECTED schools, as well as INSPECTED ones."[60] As he declared in "'Ecce, Convertimur ad Gentes'" (1879): "The point is, whether by their being public schools, State schools, they are or are not likely to be better schools, and better guaranteed, than you could get in any other way. Indisputably they are likely to be better, and to give better guarantees."[61]

iv) The Poor Quality of Teachers

Admittedly Arnold, though making copious criticisms throughout his writings on the inadequacies of elementary school teachers, referred comparatively little to the defects of teachers in secondary schools. However, he wrote enough on the subject to render it clear that in his opinion England's secondary teachers left much to be desired and in many respects were of an inferior quality to those found in certain Continental countries. The main problem which he associated with secondary teachers in England was identical with his central criticism of English education in general, namely the inadequacies or absence of guarantees of security and supervision. For with no central or authoritative controlling body secondary schools in England could employ whomsoever they wished to be school teachers, and it was not surprising that so many teachers failed to attain even minimal levels of competence. Moreover, he did not think that the existing system did very much to look after the interests of whatever good teachers there actually were in England's private schools. In answer to a critic in the Museum who, in April 1864, took him to task for generalising that all private schools with no exception were atrocious Arnold wrote as follows:

> No doubt there are some masters of cheap private schools who are doing honest and excellent work; but no one suffers more than such men themselves do from a state of things in which, from the badness of the majority of these schools, a discredit is cast over them all, bad and good alike; no one could gain more by obtaining a public, trustworthy discrimination of bad from good, an authentic recognition of merit. The teachers of these schools would then have, in their profession, a career; at present they have none.[62]

The fact that certification and supervision of teachers and their consequent competence was often the norm in Continental countries received emphasis in Arnold's major work on foreign secondary education, Schools and Universities on the Continent (1868). In France, for example, under the State system every professor in a lycée or communal college had to satisfy certain standards of certification and was subject to appointment and dismissal by the Minister of Public Instruction.[63] In addition, any one who wished to keep a private or free school was obliged to satisfy certain requirements concerning his character, his academic attainments and his experience--"he cannot, as in England, be perfectly ignorant and inexperienced in his business; neither can he, as in England, be a ticket-of-leave man, for the French law declares every man who has undergone a criminal condemnation incapable of keeping a school."[64] Though private schools were free to employ as assistant teachers whomsoever they wished such teachers were subject to certain inspection by public authorities and by the law of 1850 the authorities were empowered in matters of misconduct or immorality to take action against the head or his assistant teachers.[65] Similarly in Prussia every intending secondary school teacher had to satisfy the State authorities with respect to standards of capacity. Furthermore, this was the case not only for public schools but for those of a more private nature also, even though the latter were very few in number. For, as Arnold asserted, "No school in Prussia can be INDEPENDENT, in the sense of owing no account to any one for the teacher it employs, or the way in which it is conducted; for every school there is a VERORDNETE AUFSICHTSGEWALT, an ordained authority of supervision."[66] The overall result, as he wrote in "German and English Universities" (1868), was that in Germany, "as in France, thousands and thousands of middle-class boys are under competent and tested instructors, who with us would be a prey to mercenary and ignorant pretenders."[67] Even in Italy, though the school system in practice was by no means all that Arnold would wish it to be, the law of 1859 stipulated that those who would keep secondary schools and secondary teachers themselves furnish guarantees of capacity to State authorities, such authorities being empowered also to check that no aspect of management or teaching was contrary to morality or the laws.[68] But in England no such law existed and there was no check on whom could keep a secondary school or teach in it. Consequently, the standard of many English secondary schools, as Arnold never tired of pointing out, was often appalling. However, while the problems revolving about England's secondary teachers were obvious to Arnold, so also was the solution: organise a proper State system on the Continental model and provide the appropriate governing authority with powers of certification and supervision.

v) The Neglect of "Science" and Lack of Standardisation of Curricula and Texts

Arnold often complained of the poor quality of instruction in England's schools especially when it was compared with that of Continental institutions. In Schools and Universities on the Continent (1868) he declared that the French Minister of Public Instruction, M. Duruy, contended that throughout the Continent the young Prussians and the young Swiss of Zurich and Basle were victorious over all other nationalities in the business world and that this was due to the superiority of their instruction. In Arnold's opinion, an essential constituent factor in this superiority was the stress paid by these foreigners on the inculcation of "science" and systematic knowledge in their students. In speaking of science Arnold was not thinking of natural or applied sciences but, rather, of what he felt to be the proper method of learning and knowing things. But in England instead of this kind of science the procedure favoured was the old "rule of thumb." In short, England's approach to education was wholly amateur, whereas professionalism was the method in countries like Prussia and France:

> In nothing do England and the Continent at the present moment more strikingly differ than in the prominence which is now given to the idea of science there, and the neglect in which this idea still lies here; a neglect so great that we hardly even know the use of the word science in its strict sense, and only employ it in a secondary and incorrect sense. The English notion,--for which there is much to be said if it were not pushed to such an excess,--is, that you come to do a thing right by doing it, and not by first learning how to do it right and then doing it. [69]

It is not surprising, declared Arnold, that the English

> school system has very naturally fallen all into confusion; and though properly an intellectual agency, it has done and does nothing to counteract the indisposition to science which is our great intellectual fault. The result is, that we have to meet ~~the~~ calls of a modern epoch, in which the action of the working and middle class assumes a preponderating importance, and science tells in human affairs more and more, with a working class not educated at all, a middle class educated on the second plane, and the idea of science absent from the whole course and design of our education. [70]

Moreover, a prominent defect, in Arnold's eyes, of the neglect of science and systematic knowledge in English schools was the casualness and slapdash often shown towards the curriculum. This subject of the curriculum was one which he considered to be of especial importance and, understandably so, as he was convinced that a good and appropriate curriculum in English schools would obviously be of paramount significance in helping to effect the transformation in English society which he so earnestly desired. He considered the existing arrangement in England's secondary schools whereby teachers could teach well-nigh anything at all if they so wished a major drawback. While the great Public Schools and the chief endowed schools in the main provided, in Arnold's opinion, a satisfactory curriculum and taught it well, the great majority of secondary establishments provided a lax and generally inadequate programme of studies. The following chapter contains a more detailed discussion of the type of curricula Arnold favoured for his nation's secondary schools and, in particular, of how his proposals for curriculum reform were influenced to a great extent by what he had witnessed in foreign schools. Suffice it to say here that the major reason why Arnold often considered the curricula of England's secondary schools to be so inadequate, especially when compared with those found in Continental establishments, was because in England there existed no body, authoritative and central, which would draw up, supervise, and guarantee a coordinated and uniform curriculum which would be taught in schools. In France, on the other hand, every _lycée_ was obliged to follow the same carefully structured programme drawn up by the Council of Public Instruction.[71] However, Arnold clearly preferred the curricular control exercised in Prussia where the regulating and prescribing by the central government as manifested in the LEHRPLAN was less rigid and less detailed than in France or, indeed, in Italy.[72] But though he found French ministerial control over the curriculum to be excessive, on at least two occasions he referred with approval to the oft-told story of the French Minister of Instruction who looking at his watch declared with satisfaction that all boys in the same class in all of France's public grammar schools were now learning the same lesson. Indeed, he found nothing untoward in this. As he asked in his 1874 general report for elementary schools, thinking of the great contrast between the situation in France and England "...really, is it so lamentable to think that all schoolboys should at a given moment be reading the fourth eclogue of Virgil; or is it so delightful to think that at a given moment all schoolboys may be reading different pieces of rubbish, out of innumerable and equally accepted collections of it?"[73] In any event, Arnold insisted that there was an urgent necessity in England's secondary schools for some form of good common curriculum set forth by public authority, whether it be on the model of the rigidly homogeneous curriculum as promulgated by the French Council of Public Instruction or more like that of the Prussian LEHRPLAN which allowed the teachers greater freedom than in France but still provided in Prussian schools a curriculum much more uniform than that found in England. But if a more common school curriculum provided by public authority was needed in England so also was control over school books such as was exercised by the Provincial Boards and Ministerial authority in Prussia and the Council of Public Instruction in France. The heterogeneity of school texts in England's schools was a particularly serious problem:

> Many as are the absurdities of our state of school anarchy, perhaps none of them is more crying than the book-pest which prevails under it. Every school chooses at its own discretion; many schools make a trade of book-dealing, and therefore it is for their interest to have books which are not used elsewhere, and which the pupil will not bring with him from his last school; so that a boy who has

> been at three or four English schools has often had to buy a complete new set of school-books for each. The extravagance of this is bad enough; but then, besides, as there exists no intelligent control or selection of them, half at least of our school-books are rubbish, and to the other defects of our school system we may add this, that in no other secondary schools in Europe do the pupils spend so much of their time in learning such utter rubbish as they do in ours.[74]

A State body on the Continental model which would supervise school texts was the obvious answer to Arnold.

vi) The Educational System and the Separation of Classes

Another great problem on which Arnold frequently focused, and one which he held owed very much to the existing educational provision, was the disharmony in England, on the one hand, between the middle class and other classes and, on the other, within this former class itself. The discord between the middle and working classes was considered briefly in the preface to Schools and Universities on the Continent (1868) where Arnold reviewed the argument of certain individuals that England's labour problems were due as much to the failures of the middle classes in dealing satisfactorily with them as to the inadequacies of the working classes themselves. These people argued that instead of putting all the blame on the workers it might be better if the employers looked to the problems of their own poor education. Their schooling did not prepare them for the difficulties of employing other men and consequently labour problems arose: "'Brought up in schools of inferior standing, they have no governing qualities, no aptitude, like that of the aristocratic class for the ruling of men;

brought up with hollow and unsound teaching, they have no science, no aptitude for finding their way out of a difficulty by thought and reason, and creating new relations between themselves and the working class when the old relations fail.'"[75] This was an argument which Arnold himself obviously found congenial. However, he considered that the defects of secondary instruction were responsible for much more than difficulties in the relationship between middle class and worker.

In his report for the Newcastle Commission there is a short but interesting section on the benefits bestowed by a State system in helping to break down barriers between the upper classes and middle classes. In England the two classes with very few exceptions were educated in totally different schools with the result, according to Arnold, that they remained separate and no attempt was made to blend them together into a powerful unity. Thus, there was no contact by which the upper classes would be stimulated, and the middle elevated and refined. In France, however, blending and contact of this nature occurred because of the State secondary education system. This

> effaces between the middle and upper classes the sense of social alienation; it raises the middle without dragging down the upper; it gives to the boy of the middle class the studies, the superior teaching, the proud sense of belonging to a great school, which the Eton or Harrow boy has with us; it tends to give to the middle classes precisely what they most want, and their want of which is the great gulf between them and the upper; it tends to give them personal dignity. [76]

Arnold returned to this topic in 1878 in his article "'Porro Unum Est Necessarium'" declaring that though the French aristocracy attended private ecclesiastical schools and, accordingly, ones different to the public schools frequented by the middle classes they were not of superior standing to the public establishments. The relationship between the two types of school was not analogous to that existing in England between great Public Schools like Eton and Harrow and a middle class academy; it was more like that between Eton and Harrow and Stonyhurst. Consequently, he declared, the French aristocracy was "not a class which, in addition to its advantages of high birth and wealth over the middle class, has received a higher training than the middle class, in schools of a superior standing. Aristocracy and middle class are brought up in schools of one equal standing."[77] Certainly there were distinctions between the two classes, as in England, but in France the differences were not so great. The main reason was that the great homogeneous French middle class was itself too strong to allow the aristocracy to get too powerful. Arnold illustrated this by pointing to differences in the composition of the English and French governments. The members of the former were almost all aristocrats with one or two individuals from the professional class, the members of the latter were every one of them from the professional and middle class. Arnold acknowledged that much of this political difference was due to changes wrought to the property and standing of the French aristocracy since the French Revolution, but he asserted that more was due to the education of the French middle class. In that country all members of the middle class were educated together in the same type of schools. The French did not contribute to the breaking up of their great middle class by having different schools of unequal standing. Consequently, declared Arnold, their middle class was "larger, more homogeneous, and better educated than ours."[78] The great mass of the French middle class "has not, as with us, the sense of an inferior training. It is not cut in two, as with us; it is homogeneous. And this immense homogeneous class is brought up in schools of as good standing as those of the aristocracy; it is brought up on the first plane. It is possible and producible."[79] Moreover, Arnold, as was his wont, was at pains to stress that it was the State in France which was responsible for the middle class being educated in the first plane; he rarely lost an opportunity to praise any State educational system. As he wrote towards the end of "'Porro Unum Est Necessarium'" (1878): "the French system of public secondary instruction is one of the real, one of the best conquests of 1789 and of the Revolution."[80]

On July 7, 1864 Arnold wrote a letter to Harriet Martineau in which he dealt with the two quite distinct elements in England's great middle class, the professional and the commercial, showing particular concern about the latter part which must, he was convinced, suffer a complete transformation if England had any chance of making satisfactory progress. It is worth quoting at length:

> As you say, it is hard to distinguish classes accurately, and it is most true that almost everything has come out of the middle class; but surely this is because they have the numbers which aristocracies have not, and that start of the indispensable modicum (at least) of means and training, which the lower class have not. And may you not draw a distinction and say that the middle class divides itself into the professional half and the commercial half, and that the achievements you speak of have mainly come out of the professional half of the middle class, the class which has been most in contact with the class above, has shared its schools, has caught (too much, in some respects) its spirit? This professional half it was which filled Haileybury (a place certainly of the fashion of the old public schools) and governed India--a wonderful achievement, as you truly say; the commercial half, on the other hand, gives us the indigo-planters in India, and the adventurers

> in China--quite another thing at any rate. Of this commercial half I see a great deal through my connexion with the British schools; their drive and energy are doubtless great, but it seems to me a gulf separates them from the professional half of their class; and this is caused by their tone or rather want of tone; their intellectual dulness and narrowness is inconceivable, they have not the knowledge of the world and point of honour of aristocracies--I confess to you, if it was not for their religion (such as it is) I should despair of them. And this (quite distinct from the great, often very enlightened, merchants and manufacturers) is the class which is growing, and at no stage is it brought under really improving influences, and it is perfectly self-satisfied! I assure you I am without prejudices, I get on excellently with this class, I wish to see the good in them, I think I do see it; but, if we are to grow any more and not to become a second and bigger Holland, I am sure this class must be totally transformed in spirit.

Arnold went on to encourage Miss Martineau to aid in effecting this transformation: "Do what you can to enlarge and liberalise our middle class spirit, whether by public education or in any other way--I am sure it is an important work to be done--and you have so much power ~~for~~ working at it." [81]

In The Popular Education of France (1861) Arnold argued that the English professional classes had benefited from having been brought up at Public School and having come to be identified to a great extent with the upper classes "in thought, feeling, and manners."[82] Nevertheless, they had also suffered from such an education for, on the one hand, they had tended to become estranged from their own natural class, the middle, and, on the other, they had been inclined to adopt an overly deferential attitude in intellectual matters towards the upper classes. However, they had, "as a class, acquired the unspeakable benefit of that education of the mind and feelings which it is the best office of superior education to confer."[83] As he declared in Schools and Universities on the Continent (1868), the professions in England had come to share, from their common educational experiences, in the aristocracy's cast of ideas which, considered from their good side, was "characterised by a high spirit, by dignity, by a just sense of the greatness of great affairs,--all of them governing qualities." However, there was a bad side to this cast of ideas, namely the neglect of systematic knowledge or science, and in this respect the English professions were quite different to their counterparts on the Continent who displayed a strong aptitude for such qualities.[84] But it would be wrong to imagine that Arnold regarded the great commercial and industrial classes in England to be over imbued with science, for he did not. In fact, these latter classes received an education of even less quality than their professional and aristocratic counterparts. The overall result was that the English educational system broke up the middle classes into two separate parts and this, declared Arnold, was "to a degree unknown on the Continent." Thus England produced

> a professional class brought up on the first plane, with fine and governing qualities, but without the idea of science; while that immense business class, which is becoming so important a power in all countries, on which the future so much depends, and which in the leading schools of other countries fills so large a place, is in England brought up on the second plane, cut off from the aristocracy and the professions, and without governing qualities.[85]

Furthermore, as Arnold asserted in The Popular Education of France (1861), the benefits which the professional class had gained from their education with the aristocracy had cost them dearly in financial terms, for the fees charged at the great Public Schools were exceedingly high. Moreover, he declared that he had been informed by educational authorities in France that to expect French parents to pay such fees would be quite hopeless.[86] At any event, he contended that if the vast majority of the English middle class was not to be totally alienated from the aristocratic and professional classes then it was imperative that the State play a much greater role in the sphere of secondary education, "by its authorisation, its aid--above all, by its inspection." In this way, "not only will the whole richer part of our rich community be united by the strong bond of a common culture, but the establishment of a national system of instruction for the poor part of the community will have been rendered infinitely easier."[87] Indeed, he was adamant that it was "impossible to overrate the magnitude of this question" of a satisfactory system of State run middle class education. For, he asserted, superior instruction

> is comparatively of limited importance. Secondary instruction, on the other hand, is of the widest importance; and it is neither organised enough nor intelligent enough to take care of itself. The Education Commissioners [Newcastle] would excite, I am convinced, in thousands of hearts a gratitude of which they little dream, if, in presenting the result of their labours on primary instruction, they were at the same time to say to the Government, "Regard the necessities of a not distant future, and ORGANISE YOUR SECONDARY EDUCATION."[88]

C) The Defects of England's Third Level Education

Though the major concern in this work is Arnold's views on the secondary education of the middle classes it would be wrong if no reference were made to what he wrote on superior and especially university education of which these classes were partaking more and more as the century progressed. Indeed, because of the many changes and reforms which the universities were undergoing during Arnold's lifetime access to this level of education was gradually becoming more egalitarian and, though only a minority of the middle classes succeeded in attending university at this period, at least it was no longer the case that university education was the sole demesne of the aristocracy and the upper classes. There is no doubt but that some of Arnold's Philistines were beginning to gain degrees. But it is also true that for much of his life England trailed many other nations in her university provision. Besides Oxford and Cambridge, both ancient institutions, there was only the University of London which, after its beginnings as a College in Gower Street in 1828, received its charter to grant degrees in 1836 and also the University of Durham, chartered in 1832, but which for many decades remained small with few students. It was only later in the century that the new civic universities were established. But though his writings on elementary and secondary education in England were extensive Arnold wrote relatively little on universities and other higher education. As he declared in The Popular Education of France (1861), "English superior instruction is perhaps intelligent enough to be left to take care of itself. [It] is the efflorescence and luxury of education; it is comparatively of limited importance."[89] Indeed, at one stage of his life he was at least as concerned with the problem of establishing a Roman Catholic University in Ireland somewhat on the lines of the predominantly Catholic University of Bonn in Protestant Prussia or the predominantly Protestant University of Strasbourg in Catholic France, as with the state of England's higher educational system.[90] He was certainly interested in higher education and particularly in the affairs of the two ancient universities but, in his writings at least, he for the most part ignored the multitude of changes which were occurring in this sphere during the second half of the century. We would get little clue from reading him that Oxford and Cambridge were at this time undergoing major reforms. Of course, the principal reason for this is that most of what he wrote about higher education is contained in his report for the Taunton Commission, later published in 1868 as Schools and Universities on the Continent. Many of the changes and reforms were still to happen. Much of "A Liverpool Address," a lecture delivered in September 1882 at the opening of the winter term of Liverpool University College, is also concerned with university education, and more particularly with prescriptions for improving it, but it by no means provides an extensive analysis of the contemporary state of English higher education.

Nevertheless, despite the fact that he wrote comparatively little about them, England's universities, and above all Oxford, played a significant part in Arnold's life. His father, Thomas Arnold, had been a great Oxford figure, having become a fellow of Oriel, a Doctor of Divinity and for a brief period before his death Regius Professor of Modern History, a post which he held concurrently with his headmastership of Rugby. Matthew himself, after a not particularly distinguished undergraduate career, though he won the Newdigate Prize for Poetry, also became a fellow of his father's College and in 1857 was appointed Professor of Poetry, a post he held for ten years. Furthermore, as was natural for one of his class, a large proportion of his friends and intimates were Oxford and Cambridge men who, just as he himself, had been moulded to a great extent by the distinctive mores and traditions of these ancient institutions.

Though he was by no means an uncritical admirer of Oxford Arnold consistently displayed a strong affection for his alma mater and complimentary references are frequent in his writings. As he wrote to his daughter Lucy, late in his life: "I think Oxford is still, on the whole, the place in the world to which I am most attached."[91] He was especially pleased when Oxford awarded him an honorary D.C.L. in 1870: "Nothing could more gratify me, I think, in the way of an honour, than this recognition by my own University, of which I am so fond, and where, according to their own established standard of distinctions, I did so little."[92] Perhaps his greatest compliment to Oxford is the purple passage concluding his Preface to his Essays in Criticism (1865):

> And yet, steeped in sentiment as she lies, spreading her gardens to the moonlight, and whispering from her towers the last enchantments of the Middle Age, who will deny that Oxford, by her ineffable charm, keeps ever calling us nearer to the true goal of all of us, to the ideal, to perfection,--to beauty, in a word, which is only truth seen from the other side?--nearer, perhaps, than all the science of Tübingen. Adorable dreamer, whose heart has been so romantic! who hast given thyself so prodigally, given thyself to sides and to heroes not mine, only never to the Philistines! home of lost causes, and forsaken beliefs, and unpopular names, and impossible loyalties! what example could ever so inspire us to keep down the Philistine in ourselves, what teacher could ever save us from that bondage to which we are all prone, that bondage which Goethe, in his incomparable lines on the death of Schiller, makes it his friend's highest praise (and nobly did Schiller deserve the praise) to have left miles out of sight behind him;--the bondage of "was uns alle bändigt, DAS GEMEINE!" She will forgive me, even if I have unwittingly drawn upon her a shot or two

> aimed at her unworthy son; for she is generous, and the cause in which I fight is, after all, hers. Apparitions of a day, what is our puny warfare against the Philistines compared with the warfare which this queen of romance has been waging against them for centuries, and will wage after we are gone? [93]

In similar tone was his fervent praise of Oxford's "sentiment for beauty and sweetness" in his last lecture as Professor of Poetry, later published as "Sweetness and Light," Chapter I of Culture and Anarchy (1869).[94] He also had a strong regard for Cambridge which, in his first published version (1882) of "Literature and Science," contrasting her with Oxford, he called "the University not of great movements, but of great men."[95] At any rate, it is clear that he had a deep regard for these venerable institutions, though he was fully cognizant that they could be improved in many respects. But the relatively few prescriptions which he made for changing England's university structure were more concerned with enlarging the general provision of superior education throughout the nation, thereby making third level education as available as it was in France and Germany. For even if Cambridge and his beloved Oxford, together with the great Public Schools, were improved, they would still only affect England's upper class and relatively few of the swelling middle classes. Arnold, in fact, believed that the out-dated education which the old universities gave to the small number of students was a satisfactory one for the role which most of them would later assume in life. These institutions "long maintained a course which the modern spirit, not altogether without justice, decried as antiquated but [they] nevertheless formed generations able to fill, not ignobly, their part in Church and State."[96] There was much to be said in their favour and in their narrow function they constituted what foreigners envied most in English education.[97] But, as Arnold remarked in *Schools and Universities on the Continent* (1868), in the words of Carlo Matteucci, Minister of Public Instruction in Italy, Oxford and Cambridge were not institutions of higher education at all, but ony "hauts lycées", a phrase which Arnold repeated on a number of occasions.[98] These institutions, he believed,

> though invaluable in their way as places where the youth of the upper class prolong to a very great age, and under some very admirable influences, their school education, and though in this respect to be envied by the youth of the upper class abroad and if possible instituted for their benefit, yet, with their college and tutor system, nay, with their examination and degree system, they are still, in fact, SCHOOLS, and do not carry education beyond the stage of general and school education.[99]

They did nothing to develop in their students science or systematic knowledge, a fundamental purpose of a university in Arnold's opinion [100], and something which the universities in Germany, not being "hauts lycées", had as their chief aim. "It is in science that we have most need to borrow from the German universities."[101] Superior education, he asserted, should allow the student to pursue those studies for which he has a natural aptitude and to do so "systematically under first-rate teaching" but the ancient universities did "next to nothing towards this end." Indeed, their neglect of teaching science or systematic knowledge was clearly demonstrated by the fact that their B.A. examinations were nothing other than the final examinations of the secondary school abroad, the ABITURIENTENEXAMEN of Germany, or the ÉPREUVE DU BACCALAURÉAT of France. (This was an opinion expressed by Arnold in 1868 and it seems quite extreme. Oxford and

Cambridge at this period were making headway in their reforms in a number of spheres, the academic curriculum being an important one. Certainly, by the later years of Arnold's life the ancient universities had changed dramatically, and for the better most would agree, from the time he himself was a student at Oxford in the 1840s. At any rate, it serves as a reminder that many of his views on English and foreign education are at least open to debate). Moreover, the German and French universities had true scientific instruction for their masters' and doctors' degrees, but Oxford and Cambridge had no instruction at all for these qualifications. But the University of London was even worse, he opined, for it was only a board of examiners enpowered to grant degrees. It gave no instruction at all. Consequently, when an English student wanted first-rate teaching and systematic study he was obliged to go to Paris, Heidelberg or Berlin where the universities earnestly sought by their instruction to foster science and systematic knowledge.[102] For if "it is the function of the university to develope into science the knowledge a boy brings with him from the secondary school, at the same time that it directs him towards the profession in which his knowledge may most naturally be exercised" then, as Arnold believed, "our English universities do not perform the function of a university, as that function is above laid down."[103] Accordingly, he asked rhetorically: "who can estimate the loss to the mental training and intellectual habits of the country, from an absence,--so complete that it needs genius to be sensible of it, and costs genius an effort to repair it,--of all regular public provision for the scientific study and teaching of any branch of knowledge?"[104]

Perhaps the paramount problem identified by Arnold in his 1868 report for the Taunton Commission in England's post-secondary education was the small number of students at this level, and this was especially obvious when it was compared with France and Prussia: "Abroad far more than in England, where university instruction is the privilege of comparatively few, secondary instruction leads to superior or university instruction."[105] For example, he related that in 1862 out of a population of nearly 37,500,000 France had 23,371 students in her five faculties of theology, law, medicine, sciences, and letters, in addition to those students attending special schools. Prussia, at this time, had 6,362 matriculated students at her eight universities out of a population of about 18,500,000. But England with 20,000,000 inhabitants could only number about 3,500 matriculated students. Accordingly, "England, with her wealth and importance, has barely one-half the proportion of her population coming, even nominally, under superior instruction, that Prussia and France have." Moreover, Arnold held that the statistics were even worse than this as, Oxford and Cambridge being merely "hauts lycées" and London University only an examining board, most of the three and a half thousand students did not actually receive what he regarded as real superior instruction. Furthermore, this inadequacy at the higher educational level was having a general weakening effect on the nation:

> This entire absence of the crowning of the edifice not only tends to give us, as I have said, a want of scientific intellect in all departments, but it tends to weaken and obliterate, in the whole nation, the sense of the value and importance of human knowledge; to vulgarise us, to exaggerate our estimate, naturally excessive, of the importance of material advantages, and to make our teachers, all but the very best of them, pursue their calling in a mere trade spirit, and with an eye to little

> except these advantages. [106]

Consequently, the number of higher education students in England, Arnold was convinced, had to be raised, to a figure of at least 8,000.[107]

D) "Schools in the Reign of Queen Victoria"

On June 15, 1887 was published a compilation of different articles by well-known personages commemorating the fiftieth year of Queen Victoria's reign, with the essay "Schools in the Reign of Queen Victoria" being contributed by Matthew Arnold. As Super ~~writes,~~ this "is a valuable survey of a period in education most of which Arnold knew at first hand and in which he played a significant part."[108] It is also vey useful for our purposes in revealing Arnold's most mature thoughts, written as it was in the year before his death, on the state and prospects of England's secondary education. In addition, it is particularly interesting in showing how consistent Arnold remained throughout his life in his views on the inadequacies of this sphere of education, especially when compared with that of the Continent, and in his recommendations for improving it. He began his section on secondary schools in this survey of the educational scene in England during the past fifty years by declaring that when the Monarch ascended the throne England's elementary schools were in chaos, but now a half century later there was a national system. However, secondary education still remained in the same chaos as it had been when the reign began.[109] "Chaos" though a strong word was still a favourite with Arnold in this connection. Almost two decades before in 1868 at the conclusion of his

Schools and Universities on the Continent, referring to his earlier report for the Newcastle Commission where he had uttered the injunction to organise England's secondary education, he declared that this advice went unheeded for "our secondary instruction is still the chaos it was."[110] But in 1887 he could again assert that little had changed for even now "our secondary education is a chaos."[111] The problem was that little attention had been paid to the state of middle class education since the late fifties and sixties when the Government had set up inquiries and commissions to examine different aspects of education in England. He quoted from the General Report of the Schools Inquiry (Taunton) Commission:

> 'There is no public inspector to investigate the educational condition of a school by direct examination of the scholars, no public board to give advice on educational difficulties, no public rewards given directly to promote educational progress except those distributed by the Science and Art Department, hardly a single mastership in the gift of the Crown, not a single payment from the central government to the support of a secondary school, not a single certificate of capacity for teaching given by public authority professedly to teachers in schools above the primary schools. In any of these senses there is no public school and no public education for the middle and upper classes. The State might give test, stimulus, advice, dignity; it withholds them all.' [112]

But now, 22 years later, he declared, the above account was still a true representation--there had been little change.

Nevertheless, Arnold admitted that those eulogistic concerning the age's progress had some, though limited, reason for asserting that the last fifty years had witnessed certain improvements in England's secondary provision. These people praised the nation's great developments in industry and commerce which they said had gone hand in hand with the introduction of modern studies and natural science in secondary schools; they argued that most provincial towns of importance had their college of science or school of art, that secondary education was receiving great help from the City guilds in this modernising movement, that day schools for both sexes were being provided by the companies, that England's secondary education had been receiving tests and supervision ever since 1854 from the examinations of the College of Praeceptors and since 1858 from the local examinations of Oxford and Cambridge. However, Arnold was not very impressed by these apologists of the improvement manifested in England's secondary schools over the last half century. To him these schools were "still very defective" and he was quite unequivocal in his criticism, once again comparing them and their products most unfavourably with their counterparts on the Continent:

> But whoever is not carried away by the torrent of jubilee, whoever has well observed our secondary schools and compared them with those of the Continent, knows that we have indeed broken up our old type of secondary instruction, but not yet founded a new one of any soundness and worth; that our provision of secondary schools is utterly incoherent and inadequate; that the local examinations supply us with neither the tests nor the supervision really requisite; that the bulk of the middle class in this country is worse educated than the corresponding class in Germany, Switzerland, Holland, Belgium, or even the United States; that it is brought up on an inferior plane, in schools both of lower standing and worse taught.[113]

Once more Arnold proffered his oft-repeated explanation for this "serious evil," namely that the upper classes did not wish to be disturbed in their preponderance, nor the middle classes in their vulgarity. The fact that they might be unconscious of this mattered not a whit--"Their action is the same, and its hurtful consequences."[114] The great problem facing England, according to Arnold, though he asserted that few were willing to recognise it, was due to the inadequacies of the middle classes rather than those of the lower classes. He realised that this was not a popular opinion as most people assigned difficulties in the sphere of trade, commerce and industry to the defects of the lower classes and they considered that the remedy lay in making elementary schools more technical. Certainly make these schools more "intelligent" but not more technical, declared Arnold; technical education should come after elementary school. However, the real remedy lay in transforming the civilisation of the middle class, the primary agency for so doing residing in a satisfactory public educational system. It was true, he wrote, that the English middle class enjoyed certain merits which the corresponding class in other nations did not possess but it also had certain defects which were at present to the fore:

> It has not the training which local government affords to the corresponding classes abroad, and it has a school-education markedly inferior to theirs and formative for good neither of the mind nor of the character. Its religion has done much for it, its schools have done little or nothing. Unformed itself, it exercises on the great democratic class, rising up beneath or rather around it, no formative influence; and this class, too, loses means of training both natural for it and most wholesome. May we live to see the coming of a state of things more promising! [115]

It is not surprising that Arnold continued by asserting that what was to be aimed at was a thorough State educational system, with a Minister of Education and an Educational Council to advise him.

E) A Public Post-Elementary Educational System Essential for Transforming the Middle Classes

While the future might belong to the working classes, at present the day, in Arnold's opinion, was with the middle classes, for these constituted the most powerful body in England. But they were Philistines with their educational institutions in large measure thoroughly abysmal and, moreover, also strongly contributing to their Philistinism. Consequently, Arnold was unyielding, as we have pointed out often before, that there was urgent need that they should be reformed, so that in their new perfected state they might become a really major power in English society. He was quite clear how this transformation should be effected: "And I cannot see any means so direct and powerful for developing this great and beneficient power as the public establishment of schools for the middle class."[116] As he wrote in a letter to Macmillan on February 2, 1864: "I am quite sure the whole future of the middle classes depends upon their giving a public establishment to their education and so getting their minds more opened and their characters more dignified. There is a ferment among them just now which seems to me to give one a chance; but what it will all lead to, we shall see in time."[117] Such proposed public institutions were to accomplish much more than merely improve the quality of teaching or make the schools more comfortable. These State establishments were to be of paramount help in totally transforming the middle classes from a condition of Philistinism to one of genuine culture. As Arnold wrote in A French Eton (1864), shortly after the letter mentioned above, the greatest benefit which such an educational system would bestow on the children of the middle classes "would be its giving them great, honourable, public institutions for their nurture--institutions conveying to the spirit, at the time of life when the spirit is most penetrable, the salutary influences of greatness, honour, and nationality--influences which expand the soul, liberalise the mind, dignify the character."[118] Arnold was very impressed by Wilhelm Von Humboldt's one and a half years as head of the Prussian Education Department, a period, according to Arnold, during which great reforms were carried out in the higher schools of that country. In Schools and Universities on the Continent (1868) he quoted from a memorandum of that time which he declared might serve as a motto of Von Humboldt's whole administration--it also illustrates what Arnold himself considered to be the single most important purpose of higher schools (the translation from German was provided by Arnold himself): "'The thing is NOT, to let the schools and universities go on in a drowsy and impotent routine; the thing is, to raise the culture of the nation ever higher and higher by their means.'"[119] Of course, in Arnold's mind it was the culture of the middle class which was in most immediate and urgent need of being raised in England. What was "devoutly to be wished," as he wrote in "'Porro Unum Est Necessarium'" (1878), was this class's transformation. The UNUM NECESSARIUM, the one thing needful, was to educate them on the first plane, rather than the second, and in good State institutions with the objective of effecting their homogeneity, intelligence, and civilisation.[120] As he declared in "A Liverpool Address" (1882), the best vehicle for engendering a spirit of lucidity in this class was the schools and universities.[121] Though he acknowledged in "'Ecce, Convertimur ad Gentes'" (1879) that even when the requisite State schools were established they might still be imperfect, still he considered that they would produce young people who would be far better educated than the present middle class schools were capable of producing, such schools, he maintained, being the worst in civilised Europe.

> And the improvement so wrought must tell in the end, and will gradually fit the middle classes to understand better themselves and the world, and to take their proper place, and to grasp and treat real politics,--politics far other than their politics of Dissent, which seem to me quite played out. This will be a work of time. Do not suppose that a great change of this kind is to effected off hand. But we may make a beginning for it at once, and a good beginning, by public schools for the middle classes. [122]

In "Irish Catholicism and British Liberalism," an article published in 1878, and in two 1881 ones, "The Incompatibles" and "An Unregarded Irish Grievance," all three concerned with aspects of affairs in Ireland, Arnold dealt with the necessity of transforming the English middle class by means of a State run secondary educational system. In the first of these articles Arnold enjoined the Liberals to establish a public system of middle class schools, "such as in all other civilised countries it enjoys." Schools of this nature were certainly needed for the Irish middle class but, declared Arnold, if the Irish were to be ruled by the English middle class they had a right to ask that this latter class also receive a satisfactory education. But he believed that the establishment of such a system of public secondary schools in England was hindered because "both the upper and the middle class have a lurking sense that by such schools the middle class would be transformed; and the upper class do not care to be disturbed in their preponderance, or the middle class in their vulgarity. To convince the one resistance of its selfishness, and the other of its folly, should be the aim of all true Liberals."[123] Three years later in "The

Incompatibles" Arnold, as we have mentioned, likened England's secondary education to that depicted in Dickens' David Copperfield. It was little wonder, he maintained, that the Irish were estranged from the English for the civilisation of England was far from congenial to them; in particular the middle class's "pedantry, bigotry, and narrowness" made it difficult for any reconciliation to take place between the two nations. If there were to be any hope of the English winning over the Irish then it was essential to effect the transformation of the English middle class and its civilisation. Furthermore, Arnold saw no step providing so much promise in doing this as "the abolishment of Salem House and of Mr. Creakle."[124] He was realistic enough to recognise that Anglo-Irish relations could not quickly and easily be improved, but with the English middle class remaining unchanged it only rendered the task so much more difficult. Accordingly, he made resort to his accustomed recommendation to institute State run secondary schools; this, he admitted, would not provide a panacea for all of England's problems, "but they are the indispensable preliminary to our real improvement on almost all the lines where as a nation we now move with embarrassment."[125] Though Arnold was adamant regarding the necessity for drastic and urgent action he understood only too well the problems of persuading others to his point of view, one of the chief of these problems, as we have mentioned earlier, being the self satisfaction of the middle classes with their existing private and independent secondary establishments. Though proposals, he acknowledged, were sometimes broached to improve middle class schooling they were palliatives at best. More frequent was the tendency to praise the existing schools, not to criticise them. At any rate, he himself was quite assured that if there were to be any hope of persuading the Irish to agree to closer attachments to England, "not only must we offer healing political measures, we must also, and that as speedily as we can, transform our middle class and its social civilisation."[126] The same message was delivered quite unequivocally in "An Unregarded Irish Grievance" (1881) where Arnold stressed the inadequacies of both Irish and English middle class education, an inferior education which necessarily contributed to an inferior civilisation. "Surely," he declared, "it must make a difference to the civilisation of a middle class, whether it is brought up in ignoble schools where the instruction is nearly worthless, or in schools of high standing where the boy is carried through a well-chosen course of the best that has been known and said in the world!". As expected, the best remedy for this state of affairs in England, to Arnold at any rate though not, as he admitted, to others, was the setting up of a good system of public secondary schooling.[127]

Thus, Arnold on a number of occasions urged the establishment of a good system of public education for England's middle class in writings where he was also at pains to stress the inadequacies of existing middle class education in Ireland and the crying need to create in that country also a public system. In addition, in his 1882 article "A Word about America" he declared that the unsatisfactory nature of England's secondary education had another foreign counterpart, this time in America, and he contended that there was a necessity that schools at this level in both nations be reformed. The two countries were in urgent need of secondary schools of a high standard for the education of twelve- to eighteen-year-olds which would provide a serious programme, different to that of the English classical and commercial academies, and one exactly geared to the wants and abilities of the students--"this, I repeat, is what American civilisation in my belief most requires, as it is what our civilisation, too, at present most requires. The special present defects of both American civilisation and ours are the kind of defects for which this is a natural remedy."[128] Accordingly, though England might be falling behind certain Continental countries in the provision of a good system of secondary education Arnold recognised that she was not alone in this particular inadequacy.

The following chapter contains an examination of the changes which Arnold, strongly influenced by his comparative educational experiences, fervently desired should be effected in England's secondary and higher education so that the middle classes might be transformed and an "intellectual deliverance" be introduced into the nation.

6

REFERENCES

1. "'Porro Unum Est Necessarium,'" *Prose Works* 8:348.
2. "The Incompatibles," *Prose Works* 9:283.
3. "An Eton Boy," *Prose Works* 10:24.
4. Letter to his sister Fan, Wednesday (January 1879), Russell, *Letters* 2:153-154.
5. "A Liverpool Address," *Prose Works* 10:77, 75.
6. "My Countrymen," *Prose Works* 5:19.
7. *The Popular Education of France*, *Prose Works* 2:87-88.
8. *Friendship's Garland*, Letter 1, *Prose Works* 5:41.
9. "A Speech at Westminster," *Prose Works* 7:86.
10. "'Porro Unum Est Necessarium,'" *Prose Works* 8:353; also p. 364.
11. "'Ecce, Convertimur ad Gentes,'" *Prose Works* 9:18.
12. "The Future of Liberalism," *Prose Works* 9:147.
13. "An Unregarded Irish Grievance," *Prose Works* 9:296; also p. 304.
14. Preface to *Schools and Universities on the Continent*, *Prose Works* 4:27, 15.
15. "'Porro Unum Est Necessarium,'" *Prose Works* 8:353.
16. Lowry, Young, Dunn, *Note-books*, p. 28, p. 32.
17. *Culture and Anarchy*, *Prose Works* 5:130; "My Countrymen," *Prose Works* 5:4-5. The sarcastic treatment meted out by Arnold to Bazley on account of his satisfaction with middle class education was also bestowed on others such as Edward Miall, leader of the Dissenters, and newspapers such as the *Nonconformist*, the *Daily News*, the *Daily Telegraph*, the *Morning Star* among others. See, for example "My Countrymen," *Prose Works* 5:4-6; "'Porro Unum Est Necessarium,'" *Prose Works* 8:352; also Lowry, Young, Dunn, *Note-books*, p. 211.
18. "German and English Universities," *Prose Works*, 4:330.
19. "An Unregarded Irish Grievance," *Prose Works* 9:308. See also a report of a speech by Arnold at Dulwich College in *The Times*, July 30, 1885, p. 8, col. 2, in *Prose Works* 10:256.
20. "Education and Competition," Letter to the Editor of the *Pall Mall Gazette*, October 5, 1870, *Prose Works* 6:414. It is not

certain that this letter is by Arnold; for a discussion of the question by Super see Prose Works 6:501-502.

21. A French Eton, Prose Works 2:281.

22. Friendship's Garland, Letter VI, Prose Works 5:70-71.

23. Letter to J.G. Fitch, October 14, 1880, Russell, Letters 2:184.

24. "The Incompatibles," Prose Works 9:274.

25. Ibid., p. 275.

26. Ibid., pp. 276-277.

27. Ibid., pp. 275-276.

28. "'Porro Unum Est Necessarium,'" Prose Works 8:368.

29. Introd. to The Popular Education of France, Prose Works 2:22.

30. Conclusion to Schools and Universities on the Continent, Prose Works 4:308.

31. A French Eton, Prose Works 2:279-280. For a description of the schools at Toulouse and Sorèze see Ibid., pp. 265 et seq..

32. Ibid., p. 297. See also Introd. to The Popular Education of France, Prose Works 2:22.

33. "An Unregarded Irish Grievance," Prose Works 9:303-304.

34. "'Ecce, Convertimur ad Gentes,'" Prose Works 9:14.

35. "Schools in the Reign of Queen Victoria," Prose Works 11:239.

36. A French Eton, Prose Works 2:283.

37. Letter to Macmillan, February 16, 1864, Buckler, Books, p. 106.

38. Arnold quoted from the Toulouse prospectus: "'L'administration des lycées est complètement étrangère a toute idée de spéculation et de profit.'" Nor, he asserted, was this "a mere advertising puff, for the public is the real proprietor of the lyceums, which it has founded for the education of its youth, and for that object only; the directors of the lyceum are simple servants of the public, employed by the public at fixed salaries." [A French Eton, Prose Works 2:271 (note)].

39. Ibid., pp. 283-284.

40. Arnold was nearly always most stern in his criticism of England's secondary schools for the middle classes and he rarely missed an opportunity to display his contempt for them. However, once or

twice he relaxed his sternness and sounded a more positive note. Thus, in his essay "An Eton Boy," published in the June 1882 edition of the *Fortnightly Review*, he mixed a certain limited praise with his accustomed adverse criticism of these schools: "I quitted it, but I should like the leave-taking to be a kind one. I have said a great deal of harm of English secondary instruction. It deserves all the blame that I have cast upon it, and I could wish everybody to grow more and more impatient of its present condition amongst us. Necessarily, as I wished to make people dissatisfied with the thing, I have insisted upon its faults; I have insisted upon the faults of the civilisation which goes along with it, and which is in a considerable measure the product of it. But our actual secondary schools, like our actual civilisation, have the merit of existing. They are not, like all projects for recasting them, an ideal; they have the merit of existing. They are the MODUS VIVENDI, as the phrase now is, the schools and the civilisation are the MODUS VIVENDI found by our nation for its wants, and brought into fact, and shape, and actual working. The good which our nation has in it, it has put into them, as well as the bad. They live by the good in them rather than by the bad. At any rate, it is to the good which dwells in them, and in the nation which made them, that we have to appeal in all our projects for raising them, and for bringing them nearer to the ideal which lovers of perfection frame for them." ("An Eton Boy," *Prose Works* 10:24) However, the few preceding remarks are not very representative of Arnold's usual writings on English middle class schools and in any event they do not really amount to a very positive attitude towards them or to a dramatic change of heart on his part.

41. Letter to his mother, February 16, 1864, Russell, *Letters* 1:227.

42. *A French Eton*, *Prose Works* 2:282. Arnold wrote in his General Report on Elementary Schools for 1867 that over the last 30 years English primary schools had benefited from their increasing public character which had provided them with plainness and helped them avoid the evils of charlatanism and private speculation. "It is in this respect that our primary schools compare so favourably with the private adventure schools of the middle class, that class which, Mr. Bright says, is perfectly competent to manage its own schools and education. The work in the one is appraised by impartial educated persons; in the other, by the common run of middle-class parents." To illustrate the difference Arnold juxtaposed two letters, the first by an 11 year old girl pupil in a public elementary school, the other by a boy from a private middle-class school:

> DEAR FANNY,--I am afraid I shall not pass in my examination; Miss C ----- says she thinks I shall. I shall be glad when the Serpentine is frozen over, for we shall have such fun; I wish you did not live so far away, then you could come and share in the game. Father cannot spare Willie, so I have as much as I can do to teach him to cipher nicely. I am now sitting by the school fire, so I assure you I am very warm. Father and mother are very

> well. I hope to see you on Christmas Day. Winter is coming; don't it make you shiver to think of? Shall you ever come to smoky old London again? It is not so bad, after all, with its bustle and business and noise. If you see Ellen T --- will you kindly get her address for me. I must now conclude, as I am soon going to my reading class; so good bye.
>
> From your affectionate friend,
>
> M--

and the boy's:

> MY DEAR PARENTS,--The anticipation of our Christmas vacation abounds in peculiar delights. Not only that its "festivities," its social gatherings, and its lively amusements crown the old year with happiness and mirth, but that I come a guest commended to your hospitable love by the performance of all you bade me remember when I left you in the glad season of sun and flowers.
>
> And time has sped fleetly since reluctant my departing step crossed the threshold of that home whose indulgences and endearments their temporary loss has taught me to value more and more. Yet that restraint is salutary, and that self-reliance is as easily learnt as it is laudable, the propriety of my conduct and the readiness of my services shall ere long aptly illustrate. It is with confidence I promise that the close of every year shall find me advancing in your regard by constantly observing the precepts of my excellent tutors and the example of my excellent parents.
>
> We break up on Thursday the 11th of December instant, and my impatience of the short delay will assure my dear parents of the filial sentiments of
>
> Theirs very sincerely,
>
> N--.
>
> P.S.--We shall reassemble on the 19th of January. Mr. and Mrs. P. present their respectful compliments.

Arnold concluded by stating: "To those who ask what is the difference between a public and a private school, I answer, IT IS THIS." (Reports on Elementary Schools, ed. Sandford, pp. 131-133).

43. "'Ecce, Convertimur ad Gentes,'" Prose Works 9:3.

44. Letters to Thomas Humphry Ward, October 26 and 30, 1878, The A.K. Davis-Matthew Arnold Collection, Univ. of Virginia Library, No. 4885, Box 19 (Ms. Kirsch's transcripts).

45. Schools and Universities on the Continent, Prose Works 4:167. These words occur in a letter to the Times of October 30, 1866, from John Flint, Registrar to the Royal Commission on Popular Education. See also Prose Works 4:369 (notes).

46. A French Eton, Prose Works 2:298.

47. Introd. to *The Popular Education of France*, *Prose Works* 2:22.

48. "A Liverpool Address," *Prose Works* 10:77-78.

49. "German and English Universities," *Prose Works* 4:330-331.

50. *Schools and Universities on the Continent*, *Prose Works* 4:175.

51. *The Popular Education of France*, *Prose Works* 2:89.

52. "An Unregarded Irish Grievance," *Prose Works* 9:302. Mahaffey had contributed a section to the 1881 Report of the Endowed Schools, Ireland, Commission.

53. *Schools and Universities on the Continent*, *Prose Works* 4:314.

54. *Culture and Anarchy*, *Prose Works* 5:154.

55. Ibid., p. 154.

56. Ibid., pp. 154-155. See also "'Porro Unum Est Necessarium,'" *Prose Works* 8:353. Moreover, Arnold considered that these very different Continental and English practices were evident in almost every other sphere of activity besides education: "While, on the Continent, the idea prevails that it is the business of the heads and representatives of the nation, by virtue of their superior means, power, and information, to set an example and to provide suggestions of right reason, among us the idea is that the business of the heads and representatives of the nation is to do nothing of the kind, but to applaud the natural taste for the bathos showing itself vigorously in any part of the community, and to encourage its works. (*Culture and Anarchy*, *Prose Works* 5:155).

57. Chapter II, pp. 90-92.

58. "'Porro Unum Est Necessarium,'" *Prose Works* 8:358-359. See also Preface to *Schools and Universities on the Continent*, *Prose Works* 4:28; also *Schools and Universities on the Continent*, *Prose Works* 4:307-308.

59. *A French Eton*, *Prose Works* 2:282-283.

60. Ibid., p. 91.

61. "'Ecce, Convertimur ad Gentes,'" *Prose Works* 9:16.

62. *A French Eton*, *Prose Works* 2:290-291 (note).

63. *Schools and Universities on the Continent*, *Prose Works* 4:60 et seq.; also "'Porro Unum Est Necessarium,'" *Prose Works* 8:354.

64. *Schools and Universities on the Continent*, *Prose Works* 4:97.

65. Ibid., p. 110.

66. Ibid., p. 205; also pp. 195, 197, 202-2, 218 et seq..

67. "German and English Universities," *Prose Works* 4:330.

68. *Schools and Universities on the Continent*, *Prose Works* 4:158, 172.

69. Ibid., p. 311.

70. Ibid., p. 313.

71. Ibid., p. 76; *A French Eton*, *Prose Works* 2:268.

72. *Schools and Universities*, *Prose Works* 4:138, 190.

73. *Reports on Elementary Schools*, ed. Sandford, p. 183. See also "A Guide to English Literature," *Prose Works* 8:237.

74. *Schools and Universities on the Continent*, *Prose Works* 4:243-244.

75. Preface to *Schools and Universities on the Continent*, *Prose Works* 4:28.

76. *The Popular Education of France*, *Prose Works* 2:88. See also Introd. to Ibid., p. 23.

77. "'Porro Unum Est Necessarium,'" *Prose Works* 8:360.

78. Ibid., p. 360.

79. Ibid., pp. 360-361. Arnold's dislike of having different schools for different levels of the middle class is evident in a letter to Harriet Martineau of July 15, 1864. This practice, of course, ran totally counter to his ideal of developing a homogeneous middle class. Woodard's schools for this class were broken up in this fashion, but the school at South Molton was not one of his: "There must be something more about Mr. Woodard's schools than the prospectuses I have seen, and if I can get hold of anything you shall have it: I do not like to apply to Mr. Woodard as with his high ecclesiastical notions he looks upon my proposal to introduce a State and lay element into the management of middle class education as dangerous. There is, as you say, a large school for farmers' sons at Devonshire, at South Molton; but this is instituted on the plan of dividing the middle class very strictly into a *lower* and an *upper*, and is provided for the lower only; this I do not think a good thing. There is another middle class school, of wider scope, trying to get itself started at Framlington in Suffolk." [Letter to Harriet Martineau, July 15, 1864, *The A.K. Davis-Matthew Arnold Collection*, Univ. of Virginia Library, No. 4885, Box 15 (with the aid of Ms. Kirsch's transcript)].

80. "'Porro Unum Est Necessarium,'" Prose Works 8:367.

81. Letter to Harriet Martineau, July 7, 1864, The A.K. Davis-Matthew Arnold Collection, Univ. of Virginia Library, No. 4885, Box 15 (with the aid of Ms. Kirsch's transcript).

82. The Popular Education of France, Prose Works 2:88. See also "My Countrymen," Prose Works 5:23.

83. The Popular Education of France, Prose Works 2:88.

84. Schools and Universities on the Continent, Prose Works 4:308-309.

85. Ibid., p. 309.

86. The Popular Education of France, Prose Works 2:88-89.

87. Ibid., p. 89.

88. Ibid., pp. 89-90.

89. Ibid., p. 89.

90. See for example: Preface to the Second Edition of Higher Schools and Universities in Germany, Prose Works 7; "Roman Catholics and the State," Prose Works 7; "Irish Catholicism and British Liberalism," Prose Works 8; "The Irish University Question," Prose Works 9; "An Unregarded Irish Grievance," Prose Works 9.

91. Letter to his daughter Lucy, October 6, 1885, Russell, Letters 2:285.

92. Letter to his mother, June 7, 1870, Ibid. 2:31. See also Letter to George Smith, June 4, 1870, Buckler, Books p. 102.

93. Preface to Essays in Criticism, Prose Works 3:290; also "Emerson," Prose Works 10:166. Years earlier in a letter to his wife from Cambridge he had also referred to the medieval aspect of Oxford: "Yet I feel that the Middle Ages and all their poetry and impressiveness are in Oxford and not here." (Letter to his wife, March 2, 1853, Russell, Letters 1:26) In a letter to his brother Thomas on May 15, 1857 Arnold wrote of the "sentiment" of Oxford: "I am hardly ever at Oxford now, but the sentiment of the place is overpowering to me when I have leisure to feel it and can shake off the interruptions which it is not so easy to shake off now as it was when we were young." [Letter to Thomas Arnold, Jr., May 15, 1857, The A.K. Davis-Matthew Arnold Collection, Univ. of Virginia Library, No. 4885, Box 13 (with the help of Ms. Kirsch's transcript)].

94. Culture and Anarchy, Prose Works 5:106. See also letter to his mother, June 4, 1867, Russell, Letters 1:364; Letter to George Smith, June 9, 1867, Buckler, Books, p. 85; letter to his brother

Edward, July 23, 1867, Russell, Letters 1:370-371.

95. "Literature and Science," published in the Nineteenth Century, August 1882, Prose Works 10:549. Laudatory comments may also be found in a letter to his wife, July 26, 1863, Russell, Letters 1:197-198, and letter to his son, December 3, 1880, Ibid., 2:186.

96. The Popular Education of France Prose Works 2:188.

97. Schools and Universities on the Continent, Prose Works 4:68.

98. See, for example: Ibid., pp. 68, 133, 319, 320; "German and English Universities," Prose Works 4:331.

99. Schools and Universities on the Continent, Prose Works 4:319. In a letter to his mother in June, 1863 he wrote: "I have just been reading a foreign review article on the University of Oxford, and the writer, pointing out how the mere schoolboy instruction of the colleges has superceded the University instruction, says: 'Le vide se fait autour des chaires de l'Université: les hautes études ont des représentants que personne n'écoute et ne comprend; l'étudiant reste toujours écolier." (Letter to his mother, June 16, 1863, Russell, Letters 1:195).

100. Schools and Universities on the Continent, Prose Works 4:309, 318; "'Porro Unum Est Necessarium,'" Prose Works 8:352.

101. Schools and Universities on the Continent, Prose Works 4:264. See "German and English Universities," Prose Works 4:331-334.

102. Schools and Universities on the Continent, Prose Works 4:318-320.

103. Ibid., p. 254.

104. Ibid., p. 320.

105. Ibid., p. 177.

106. Ibid., pp. 320-321; also pp. 128, 255, 306-308.

107. Ibid., p. 321.

108. Super, Prose Works 11:447.

109. "Schools in the Reign of Queen Victoria," Prose Works 11:237.

110. Schools and Universities on the Continent, Prose Works 4:328.

111. "Schools in the Reign of Queen Victoria," Prose Works 11:236.

112. Quoted in Ibid., p. 237.

113. Ibid., p. 243.

114. Ibid., p. 243.

115. Ibid., pp. 244-245.

116. A French Eton, Prose Works 2:322.

117. Letter to Macmillan, February 2, 1864, Buckler, Books, p. 105.

118. A French Eton, Prose Works 2:293.

119. Schools and Universities on the Continent, Prose Works 4:209.

120. "'Porro Unum Est Necessarium,'" Prose Works 8:368-369. As Arnold wrote in Ibid.: "whereas in England the middle class is brought up on the second plane, in France the middle class is brought up on the first plane." (Ibid., p. 359).

121. "A Liverpool Address," Prose Works 10:88.

122. "'Ecce, Convertimur ad Gentes,'" Prose Works 9:18.

123. "Irish Catholicism and British Liberalism," Prose Works 8:345-346.

124. "The Incompatibles," Prose Works 9:282-283.

125. Ibid., p. 283.

126. Ibid., p. 284.

127. "An Unregarded Irish Grievance," Prose Works 9:296-297, 304.

128. "A Word about America," Prose Works 10:23. In the Preface to Culture and Anarchy Arnold quoted Ernest Renan on the problems countries like America would necessarily face because of their stress on popular and the subsequent neglect of higher education: "'The sound instruction of the people is an effect of the high culture of certain classes. THE COUNTRIES WHICH, LIKE THE UNITED STATES, HAVE CREATED A CONSIDERABLE POPULAR INSTRUCTION WITHOUT ANY SERIOUS HIGHER INSTRUCTION, WILL LONG HAVE TO EXPIATE THIS FAULT BY THEIR INTELLECTUAL MEDIOCRITY, THEIR VULGARITY OF MANNERS, THEIR SUPERFICIAL SPIRIT, THEIR LACK OF GENERAL INTELLIGENCE.'" (quoted in Preface to Culture and Anarchy, Prose Works 5:241).

CHAPTER SIX

ARNOLD'S PRESCRIPTIONS FOR IMPROVING SECONDARY AND HIGHER EDUCATION IN ENGLAND

A) Arnold's Prescriptions for Secondary School Reform

i) A Minister of Education and a Higher Council

Though Arnold spent much of his day-to-day working life examining the actual details of English elementary schools and writing quite extensively about how such institutions could, in his opinion, be improved, his practical experience of secondary schools was by no means as great. Convinced he assuredly was from early on that the vast majority of these latter schools must be reformed, a conviction which recurs over and over in his great *oeuvre*, but he usually favoured writing in general terms about how this reformation should take place. We search in vain for an abundance of detailed prescriptions or a carefully devised blue-print for transforming these institutions. As he wrote in *A French Eton* (1864): "I have no pet scheme to press, no crochet to gratify, no fanatical zeal for giving this or that particular shape to the public establishment of our secondary instruction." He only insisted that it must be a State system and that the transformation be undertaken by competent personnel.[1] He went on:

> The repartition of the charge of this new secondary instruction, the mode of its assessment, the constitution of the bodies for regulating the new system, the proportion and character of functions to be assigned to local and to central authority respectively, these are matters of detail and arrangement which it is foreign to my disposition to haggle and wrangle about. They are to be settled upon a due consideration of circumstances, after an attentive scrutiny of our existing means of operation and a discriminating review of the practice of other countries. [2]

Still, he often provided pointers and proposals which if not constituting a meticulous schema at least suggested in broad outline how such a national system might be essayed. His most detailed prescriptions may be found in his Taunton Commission report, Schools and Universities on the Continent (1868), and also to a lesser extent in his earlier A French Eton (1864). The former work shows how his proposals had been "Guided by the experience of every country [he had] visited," these being France, Italy, Germany, Switzerland; the latter study reveals his debt to educational practices in France.[3]

The first and most significant step in the establishment of the new system would be the creation of an Education Minister who would be necessary for administrative convenience and who, more important, would be "a centre in which to fix responsibility." For Arnold denied that the personnel comprising the existing Committee of Council on Education for the primary level succeeded in providing this centre.[4] Though he was fully cognizant of the opposition which the notion of an Education Minister would assuredly engender in that multitude antagonistic to State interference in England [5], he had a fervent conviction that such a figure was now essential: "I cannot but think an Education Minister a necessity for modern States."[6] In an letter published in the Pall Mall Gazette on May 30, 1870 urging the creation of a Minister of Ecclesiastical Affairs there was the implication that there should be an Education Minister also:

> To a Minister of State, as intervening in Church discipline, there are, no doubt, objections, as there are objections to a Minister of State intervening in education; all that can be said is that in modern societies, and more and more as the nature of his trust becomes more clearly conceived,

> his agency is the best available, and has
> advantages which outweigh the disadvantages.[7]

Admittedly, Arnold himself considered that there would be inconveniences connected with a Minister of Education. France, he felt, had the problem of often allowing political pressures to be strongly associated with the Ministry and in Prussia the Minister had powers which would undoubtedly be considered too extensive by Englishmen, though political influences were, in fact, far less frequent in Prussia than in France. It is true that at the time of the Taunton Commission, Arnold related, the Prussian Minister, Dr. von Mühler, a fervent Tory and evangelical, tended to be extremely particular about the character of the nation's schoolmasters and to use language which would be resented in England. Nevertheless, though Arnold himself abhorred the Minister's extreme language he wondered whether it "is in itself so much more lamentable and baneful a thing than that anarchy and ignorance in education matters, under which we contentedly suffer."[8] All in all, it is clear that he himself was in no doubt that despite a few inconveniences foreign nations had benefited greatly from the agency of an Education Minister, France having had incumbents of the calibre of François Guizot and Victor Cousin and Prussia of Wilhelm Von Humboldt.[9] It was now high time for England to follow these nations' lead, an opinion which Arnold maintained consistently. For example, on November 12, 1886 at a retirement dinner in honour of his thirty-five years as a H.M.I. Arnold again took occasion in a farewell speech to stress the imperativeness of creating a Minister of Education. He was very scornful of the notion that the Lord President of the Privy Council was in effect such a Minister, as the Duke of Richmond had claimed before the House of Lords. For, contended Arnold, one could not be a Minister merely by adopting the name; one must also perform the appropriate functions. Moreover,

> To do the functions he must put his mind to the subject of education; and so long as Lord Presidents are what they are, and education is what it is, a Lord President will not be a man who puts his mind to the subject of education. A Vice-President is not--on the Lord President's own showing--and cannot be, Minister for Education; he cannot, therefore, be made responsible for mistakes and neglects. Now, what we want in a Minister for Education is this--a centre where we can fix the responsibility. Insist, therefore--as you, the chief sufferers by mistakes and neglects in the management of education, have a right to insist--insist on having a Minister for Education.[10]

For he was insistent, as we read in "Schools in the Reign of Queen Victoria" of the following year, 1887, on the need for his country's education to have system, concert, and thought, all of which were unattainable in the absence of a centre to fix responsibility, namely a Minister together with an Educational Council which would advise him "and keep him in touch with the tendencies, needs, and school-movement of the time."[11]

But Arnold believed that a Minister of Education must not be left alone with a small board of councillors, as was the case at Berlin, to undertake the major reconstruction of English secondary education. Rather, there should be a High Council of Education, on the French [12] and Italian models, a non-political consultative body of individuals expert in educational knowledge who would advise the Minister on appropriate matters. In Schools and Universities on the Continent (1868) Arnold listed the sort of matters on which a Council would advise:

> It would be its function to advise on the propriety of subjecting children under a certain age to competitive examination, in order to determine their admission to public foundations. It would be its function to advise on the employment of the examination test for the public service; whether this security should, as at present, be relied on exclusively, or whether it should not be preceded by securities for the applicant having previously passed a certain time under training and teachers of a certain character, and stood certain examinations in connection with that training. It would be its function to advise on the organisation of school and university examinations, and their adjustment to one another. It would be its function to advise on the graduation of schools in proper stages, from the elementary to the highest school; it would be its function to advise on school books, and, above all, on studies, and on the plan of work for schools; a business which, as I have said, is more and more inviting discussion and ripening for settlement. [13]

He was confident that such a Council could easily be formed in England and that great benefits would result therefrom: "Properly composed, and properly representing the grave interests concerned in the questions it has to treat, it would not only have great weight with the minister, but great weight, as an illustrious, unpaid, deliberative, and non-ministerial body, with the country, and would greatly strengthen the minister's hand for important reforms."[14] He was in no doubt that England's "feudal and incoherent organisation" could be effectively combatted by a Council of this nature under the jurisdiction of a Minister. Together they would constitute a fundamental beginning in the supplanting of the generally untrained and incompetent individuals and small local groups who were looking after the existing secondary provision. Continental nations had a Minister and a Council who had responsibility and authority and who were subject to publicity, the result being that there rational, and not absurd, decisions were usually made. He found the series of checks regulating the organisation of government bodies in France quite praiseworthy, declaring that they were much more numerous than in a government bureau in England, "which has been extemporised to meet some urgent want, and is not part of a well-devised whole." Indeed, it often happened, he declared, that the Secretary of England's Education Department had to take it upon himself to answer questions on education which the French Minister would first have shared with his Council. Moreover, even when the Secretary conferred with the Committee of Council its members had generally no special knowledge of education.[15] In short, Arnold was strongly critical of the lack of coherence and coordination in English education which only a proper State system with the appropriate personnel and administration could remedy. A Minister and Council would form an effective beginning.

ii) Balance Between Central and Local Government

However, Arnold believed that a Minister and a Council were not everything as local controls were also of the utmost importance. Indeed, on many occasions in his writings he strenuously advocated that England adopt a system of local government on the general lines of those found in certain nations abroad. Certainly, he had little but contempt for what he felt to be the feudal and aristocratic system still existing in his own country. Of course, the middle class, he asserted, considered that they were very active in governing at the local level but what they regarded as local government was totally different to its conception abroad. For in England local self-government by the middle class was nothing other than "its habit of voluntary combination, in bodies of its own arranging, for purposes of its own choosing--purposes to be carried out within the limits fixed for a private association by its own powers." Such local government was, in other words, a reflection of the middle classes' antipathy to central government by the State and far removed from what Arnold himself or certain foreign nations understood by the notion. There was nothing regular or systematic in the English practice; rather, it was the management of their concerns "by chance private associations."[16] The municipal organisation of England's larger towns received harsh treatment at the hands of the imaginary foreign critics in "My Countrymen" (1866): "Do you suppose we should tolerate in France, Germany, Switzerland, Italy, your London Corporation and London vestries, and London as they make it? In your provincial towns you do better; but even there, do the municipalities show a tenth part either of the intelligence or the care for the ends, as we have laid them down, of modern society, that our municipalities show?"[17] Similarly, Arnold found the lack of proper local government to be glaring in England's more rural parts and particularly so relative to the situation abroad. For throughout all of England's rural areas and, indeed, the great majority of her small towns there was no Gemeinde or Commune on the Continental model, only the medieval or ecclesiastical organisation of the parish such as was found in pre-Revolutionary France. However, in contemporary France and elsewhere abroad there was a real municipal system established everywhere which "was the basis of all local affairs and the right basis."[18] The very great differences in the practice of local government, on the one hand, in France, and on the other, in England were delineated by Arnold in The Popular

Education of France (1861):

> The mayors and the municipal councils in France (with whom popular education is chiefly concerned), form a machinery for local self-government which we do not possess. The commune does not correspond to our parish, (a word still used in France, but as an ecclesiastical term only,) because the commune, even in the largest French town, is but one, while the parishes in most English towns of importance are many. But if we imagine every English borough retaining its unity of municipal organisation, and this organisation extended to every town not a borough, and above all to every country parish; if we imagine, in every small town, in every considerable village of England, an elective local council, answerable for the police, the sanitary condition, the roads, the public buildings, the public schools of their locality, we shall be able to conceive the completeness of the municipal organisation which actually exists in France. [19]

The sort of local self-government which Arnold found especially offensive was treated in a witty but still sharp manner in Friendship's Garland (1871) where he wrote of the day Arminius and himself came upon the local magistrate's court in a small country town. The magistrates on the bench that day were Viscount Lumpington, Reverend Esau Hittall, and Mr. Bottles and the main case brought before them was that of a local rustic, Zephaniah Diggs, who was accused of poaching. The ostensible aim of the anecdote was to laud England's local self-government with its voluntary feudal associations over that of Arminius' bureaucracy-ridden Prussia but, of course, Arnold really wanted to show that by retaining medieval practices of local government England was falling behind the modern spirit pervading the Continent.

Even two decades later Arnold could see little improvement in the provision of what he regarded as real local government. As he declared in a letter to the Times from Massachusetts dated July 24, 1886:

> A legislative machinery by which the localities can manage their own affairs is as much wanting in Great Britain as in Ireland. Even that basis of all local government, a municipal machinery, is wanting. We have isolated municipalities in towns; but the country as a whole in regard to municipal government is in the condition of France before the Revolution. This is because our people, being conservative, and both they and our aristocracy moderate in temper, the existing state of things has worked on without our feeling its defects to be intolerable. Local government culminates in local Legislatures. But our Parliament at Westminster has had to act both for the localities and for the nation; it is, to use the American terms, Congress and State Legislatures in one. On the whole, Parliament has done, both in England and in Scotland, what the majority wanted. Its size is now unwieldy, its work is unwieldy; moreover, we are without a safeguard and an education which organized local government affords to those who possess it; there is great need to organize it for us also.[20]

While he was in America at this time he was most impressed by the extensive local government there, just as he had been by that on the Continent, and it once again brought home to him just how much his own countrymen were lagging behind in this respect, "and what they lose by being without it."[21] As he had declared in "The Nadir of Liberalism" a few weeks earlier in May 1886, "Local government is the great need for us just now throughout these islands."[22] The following January in "The Zenith of Conservatism" he again castigated the unfavourable condition of England's local government and its failure to satisfy the needs of the modern state, this being in sharp contrast to the situation pertaining abroad: "It is known, moreover, that other nations have reformed their system of local government to meet modern needs, whilst ours remains chaotic and inefficient. And the more the advantage of the reforms effected elsewhere comes to be understood, the greater will be the impatience at our unreformed chaos."[23]

At any rate, Arnold was fully convinced that England must emulate other nations and adopt a rational system of local government,[24] and that obvious political and social advantages would undoubtedly result. One advantage would be that the transformation of the middle classes would be more easily effected "by the practice of a rational, large, and elevating system of local government."[25] At the moment, this class lacked "the training which local government affords to the corresponding classes abroad."[26] Another advantage, he believed, would be such government's role in the political education of the peasantry; indeed, it would be "more helpul by far, because so much more constant, than the exercises of the parliamentary franchise."[27] But apart from benefits of this nature he was also insistent that it was essential that a national system of elementary education rest on such a sound basis. He had seen for himself and had been most impressed by countries such as France, Germany, Italy, Switzerland which had their public elementary schools organized within the system of the Commune and its municipal government: "Nothing struck me more than this, on my return to England after seeing the Continental schools for the people, and the communal basis on which everything there rested."[28] For example, in his General Report on Elementary Schools for 1878 Arnold praised the communal schools which were the charge of the municipality of Paris. But in England where there was no real municipal system the School Boards could not be given a municipal constitution. This, he declared, was "another reason for getting a proper and complete municipal system; our school boards are 'in the air' without it. They have not, and cannot well have, a due sense of scale and proportion; they proceed as if they were educationists in Utopia."[29] As he wrote a decade earlier in Schools and Universities on the Continent (1868), he was in no doubt, with respect to his own country, that "The real preliminary to an effective system of popular education is, in fact, to provide the country with an effective municipal organisation." This, he considered, was an essential attribute of modern government.[30] In the same work he contrasted the organisation of France with that of England:

> France has now 37,500 communes, and nearly 37,500,000 inhabitants; about one commune, therefore to every 1,000 inhabitants. The mayor of the commune is named by the Crown, and represents the State, the central power; the municipal council, of which the mayor is president, is elected by universal suffrage of the commune. We have in England 655 unions and about 12,000 parishes; but our communes, or municipal centres, ought at the French rate to be 20,000 in number. Nor is this number, perhaps, more than is required in order to supply a proper basis for the national organisation of our elementary schools. A municipal organisation being once given, the object should be to withdraw the existing elementary schools from their present private management, and to reconstitute them on a municipal basis. This is not the place to enter into details as to the manner in which such a withdrawal is to be effected; I will remark only that all reforms which stop short of such a withdrawal and reconstitution are and must be mere patchwork. (Arnold was of course writing before the establishment of the School Boards by the 1870 Elementary Act) [31]

While Arnold was especially keen to have England's elementary schooling based upon a thorough system of local government it is not altogether clear just how he expected his public secondary provision would fit into such a system. Of course, there would be far fewer secondary than elementary schools and, accordingly, it would be possible to have these former schools under the jurisdiction of higher, more embracing levels of local control than would be the case for the great multitude of the latter. But it must be stressed that he was quite insistent that his public secondary establishments must come under the immediate power of appropriate local authorities and not just under the umbrella of the central State. As he asserted in A French Eton (1864): "In general, if it is agreed to give a public and coherent organisation to secondary instruction, few will dispute that its particular direction, in different localities, is best committed to local bodies, properly constituted, with a power of supervision by an impartial central authority, and of resort to this authority in the last instance."[32] Though he was consistently laudatory of State-involvement in society he frequently expressed concern about the dangers of over-centralisation such as, he believed, had occurred in France.[33] Accordingly, in Schools and Universities on the Continent (1868), mindful of the German system, he strongly recommended that eight or ten Provincial School Boards be instituted in England, with each Board being composed of, at most, five or six members, one of whom should be paid. (Though he did not say so explicitly, presumably the members would be appointed rather than elected.) Administration would be the main duty of each of these Provincial Boards: "it would represent the State in the country, keeping the Education Minister informed of local requirements and of the state of schools in each district; being the direct public organ of communication with the schools, superintending the execution of all public regulations applied to them, visiting them so far as may be necessary, and representing the State by the presence of one of its members at their main annual examinations."[34] Of course, what Arnold intended by School Boards had nothing to do with the numerous school boards and trustees each generally dealing with just one school, which already were spread throughout the country.

With respect to these eight or ten School Boards Arnold had clearly been influenced by what he had witnessed in Prussia during his work for the Taunton Commission. In the mid-1860s Prussia was constituted into eight provinces with twenty-six governmental districts or _REGIERUNGEN_. The main town of each of the provinces had a Provincial School Board or _PROVINZIAL-SCHULCOLLEGIUM_ while each of the _REGIERUNGEN_ had a Governmental District Board. Generally, the State dealt with the higher secondary schools through the Provincial Board and with the lower secondary and also the primary schools through the District Board. There was a close connection between the Boards and the State and every two or three years the Boards had to submit a report to the Minister of Education in Berlin on the school affairs in their respective province or district. There were certain powers given to local governmental authorities. For example, they regulated the EXTERNA, that is matters relating to school property, fees, admissions and so on. These authorities were also empowered to nominate teachers but nominations had to be confirmed by the State either at the provincial or central level. However, for all public schools teaching and discipline matters, or INTERNA, were controlled by the Provincial and District Boards, not the local or municipal authority.[35] Thus, in Prussia there was a balance between central and local authority with respect to secondary schools and their affairs. The State was careful to oversee as much as possible without its control being excessive. But, on no account, could a situation have existed, as in England, where the State took hardly any notice at all of what was happening in the nation's secondary schools: "It would be a mistake to suppose that the State in Prussia shows a grasping and centralising spirit in dealing with education; on the contrary, it makes the administration of it as local as it possibly can; but it takes care that education shall not be left to the chapter of accidents."[36] Arnold was also impressed by the administration of public education, both primary and secondary, in Switzerland, and particularly that of the Canton of Zurich, during his work for the Taunton Commission. Though there were very major differences between the political structure of this country and his own it is clear that he recognized that the pervasive Swiss system of local government might have something to offer to England. With respect to popular education he lauded the balance between State and local power in the Canton of Zurich, declaring that the spirit in which the series of authorities "have been contrived, balanced, and organized, is, as the English reader will perceive, an intensely democratic and an intensely local spirit; yet not insanely democratic, so that the idea of authority, not insanely local, so that the idea of the State, shall be lost sight of."[37]

In any event, to ensure that England's new secondary educational system would have good chances of success it was vital, Arnold believed, that the work of the Minister and the Higher Council be complemented by controls at a more local level. Central control on the French model would be excessive. What was to be desired was the balance between central and local government found in Prussia and Switzerland.

iii) Endowments

A problem to which Arnold turned sharp attention was one he considered a particularly patent inadequacy of the existing provision, namely the multitude of poorly administered endowments. Indeed, as he asserted in A French Eton (1864), he felt that "the age of endowments is gone."[38] It was imperative that the hundreds of "endowed schools, whose collective operations now give so little result, should be turned to better account; amalgamation should be used, the most useful of these institutions strengthened, the most useless suppressed, the whole body of them treated as one whole, destined harmoniously to co-operate towards one end."[39] In Schools and Universities on the Continent (1868) he juxtaposed the legislation in his own country with that found in France. Endowments for education, he argued, "are of far less importance in France than in England. In the first place the Revolution made a clean sweep of all old endowments; what exist date from a time since the Revolution. In the second place the French law sets limits to a man's power of disposing of his property, which in England do not exist." After giving a brief summary of this law as set out in the Code Napoléon and its provisions affecting the endowment of education Arnold concluded that "In general...the action of founders is greatly limited in France, as compared with England."[40] The time had come, therefore, for the State to step in and supervise school endowments in his own country where for a long time such endowments had often been subject to arbitrary and peculiar decisions.[41] Earlier, in "My Countrymen"

(1866), he had his imaginary foreign critics castigate the poor management of England's plentiful endowments and foundations. If only these were better applied, they said, then England's public education could be greatly improved. This was what had occurred in France and Germany where such monies were managed by proper public authorities. However, "in England they are left to private irresponsible management, and are, in nine cases out of ten, wasted."[42]

Of course, the findings of the main Taunton Report had excoriated the grossly inadequate administration of many school endowments and provided a plethora of specific examples from all over the nation.[43] In his own contribution to the Report Arnold himself was in no two minds about what should be done:

> Endowments enough have merited an absolute withdrawal from their present bad application, and an absolute appropriation by public authority for the purposes of a better application, to furnish the State with means for creating, as a commencement, a certain number of Royal or Public Schools, to be under the direct control of the Education Department and the Provincial Boards; and in which all the regulations for management, fees, books, studies, methods, and examinations, devised by public authority as most expedient, should have force unreservedly.

Furthermore, as soon as this administration was seen to work well other schools would willingly place themselves subject to public authority. In this way a system of truly public secondary schools would be established at once providing good securities and receiving proper respect.[44]

Though Arnold wrote in "Schools in the Reign of Queen Victoria" (1887), years after the publication of the Report of the Schools Inquiry

Commission, that "the views and recommendations of the Commissioners were excellent," he must have been very disappointed with the actual legislation which ensued.[45] This was the Endowed Schools Act of 1869 which empowered Commissioners to resettle the educational trusts and endowments of schools. His disapproval with the legislation is evident in a letter to his mother on June 18, 1869:

> But the work these Commissioners will do is not in the least the real work I want to see done in secondary education; and it is better, I am convinced, at least for me, to act upon the public mind till it is willing to employ the means that are really required, rather than to labour at doing what can be done with the imperfect means it is at present prepared to concede. For instance, the real thing is to substitute a skilled and much simpler machinery for the endless Boards of Trustees scattered all over the country; but the public mind is not prepared for this, so William's Commissioners are to deal with all the Boards of Trustees seriatim, and try and persuade or compel them to improve the trusts committed to their charge. It is something to do this, but the main thing is to bring the public mind to allow you to do more than this; and it is in this line that I have worked, and am likely to continue to work.[46]

Nevertheless, he acknowledged in 1887 that the Endowed School Commissioners, who in 1873 combined with the Charity Commissioners, succeeded in accomplishing good work though he implied that the numerous private schools were still not what he would wish:

> What has been gained, then, since the Schools Inquiry Commission reported in 1867, has been a very extensive resettlement, for the benefit of secondary education, of charitable trusts. Many additional endowed schools, with schemes adapting them to present local wants, have thus come into existence. Proprietary schools, likewise, have multiplied considerably. The ten thousand private schools of 1867 may also undoubtedly be taken to have multiplied, although information in regard to this entire class of schools is greatly wanting.[47]

iv) Funding

Arnold was in favour of charging school fees. As he wrote in his Annual Report for 1882 with respect to elementary education: "It has so often been said that people value more highly, and use more respectfully, what they pay a price for, that one is almost ashamed to repeat it. But the advocates of free education seem never to have heard or at least considered it."[48] In A French Eton (1864) he had suggested--though it is unclear, he was almost definitely thinking of boarding schools--that fees of L25 to L50 per annum would constitute the maximum charges which the great majority of those requiring secondary education would ever agree to pay. Certainly, the fees must be far more reasonable than was the norm at the great Public Schools. They would be closer to those charged at the despised "educational homes" (supra p. 250), though the education provided should be of a far higher standard.[49] In like manner, in the later "'Porro Unum Est Necessarium'" (1878) he recommended that the fees charged should range from L30 to L50 per annum for boarding schools and from L10 to L20 per annum for day schools.[50] These day schools were to constitute an important part of Arnold's system, for he firmly believed that besides the great need for good boarding schools at a low cost there was also a strong desire among the middle class for greater facilities for day pupils. Moreover, as he observed in A French Eton (1864), there was no question which schools were cheaper. Consequently, "those (and they are many) who think that the continuation of home-life along with his schooling is far best for the boy himself, would enjoy a double benefit in having suitable schools made accessible to them."[51]

But though Arnold was very keen to retain the practice of charging school fees in his proposed new educational system he by no means desired that the State be absolved from providing grants. In A French Eton (1864), while acknowledging that such a great undertaking as a public secondary system could not be accomplished in a short period of time, he claimed that it would be a notable beginning if the State even voted for secondary schools the sum which it had furnished three decades earlier for the elementary level, i.e. L20,000, and used this amount in establishing scholarships for these institutions. There would be the proviso that any school which wished its pupils to try for these scholarships would be obliged to submit to inspection. Though this beginning might be small, Arnold considered that after a period of ten years it would "be found to have raised the character of secondary instruction all through England."[52] Moreover, the Public Schools were benefiting from great endowments, a very old form of public aid. Again, the Universities received money from the State, and that University endowments were in effect public grants was revealed by the fact that the State had the right of involving itself in their disposal. In addition, the elementary schools were in receipt of public monies. Was there any reason therefore, he asked, why England's secondary schools should not also receive funding from the State?[53] As he was to write in 1886, abroad post-elementary education was funded by public grants as well as by fees: "In France, as in Germany and Switzerland, intermediate and higher instruction are established and aided by the State, although for instruction at these stages fees are paid."[54] His attitude towards funding by the State and payment of school fees was made very clear in his evidence before the Cross Commission on April 7,

1886. Arnold was being questioned by Lord Norton, K.C.M.G.:

> 5777. I understand you to say that you thought that secondary education should be aided by the State; to what extent would you have the State aid secondary instruction?--I would have the State or the local authority provide the buildings and see that whatever salaries are fixed as the teachers' salaries were paid; that is, of course, supplementing the school fees to the extent necessary to pay them.
> 5778. But you would not have them paid by the State?--Not directly paid by the State, because of course the school fees pay a very great part, but I would have the State pay what was necessary to supplement the school fees.
> 5779. But you would, as I understand, have no contribution from the Treasury or from the local rates to the salaries of teachers in secondary schools?--Oh, yes, I would.
> 5780. Then would you have secondary schools placed under the same system of public support as elementary schools?--Certainly, only that there should be a much larger contribution from the recipient of the schooling, because he can pay much more.
> 5781. You would make the payments of the recipients cover the whole expense, except buildings?--I do not think that with day schools these payments could cover the whole expense if the teachers are properly paid. They are not found to do it abroad, and things are very carefully done there.[55]

It is true that in his General Report for 1878 Arnold stated that he was dismayed at the great disparity between the cost of education at the elementary level for each child in France and that of each child in a Board School in England and Wales, the latter being much greater. For England and Wales "we spend, on the whole, for each child more than France spends for two children, and the London School Board spends for each child more than France spends for three children."[56] Consequently, he realised that there would be antagonism to even more public funds being spent on another level, that of secondary education: "I am desirous of seeing secondary instruction made a public service. But the prodigality of our present outlay on elementary instruction interposes an obstacle. Public elementary instruction costs so much, that people are alarmed at the notion of making any other instruction a public charge too."[57] But he was resolute that just because funding for elementary schools was excessive this by no means signified that the State should not also contribute to secondary schools. Rather, he himself was in favour of simplifying "without loss of efficiency" elementary education, especially as the country was not in 1878 as prosperous as formerly. But though he wanted economies made in the expenditures on elementary education he could still write

> I confess I am afraid of the cold fit following the hot one, in a season of less prosperity. I am afraid of a storm of discontent and obloquy raised against our very expensive system of elementary schools, and of the outlay upon them being as much over-shrunk as it is now, I think, over-swoln. [58]

On the general financial question Arnold also considered (and praised) the efforts of Nathaniel Woodard to provide secondary institutions from the pockets of private subscribers; however, he denied that Woodard's system would ever be able to furnish the great number of secondary schools urgently required for the middle classes throughout the whole of England. Rather, the only feasible solution to the problem of supplying a sufficiency of fit schools was, he believed, by means of public grants.[59] Similarly, in a letter to the Pall Mall Gazette of January 17, 1866 he lauded the efforts of the Rev. William Rogers and others who endeavoured with considerable success to raise money by means of subscriptions for the purpose of establishing secondary schools in London for the children of the lower middle class. But, Arnold declared, though the English had proved to be wonderful at contributing to a subscription list: "Any one who doubted whether they were equally wonderful at organising on the wisest plan a great public service will perhaps retain his doubts still." The Rev. Rogers and his associates might very well be excellent at garnering money and setting up and controlling one or a small number of schools, but such individuals or even groups of individuals could never be able to coordinate and control a nation-wide system of establishments. Voluntary efforts and subscriptions, Arnold was convinced, nobly intentioned though they might be, were not what was urgently required if a good national system of secondary education were to be established:

> Schemes, excellent, benevolent schemes, like that of Mr. Rogers and his alderman, will keep up appearances; and we shall be able to flatter ourselves that the work is being done. A few good schools will probably be established; so much is gain. But an adequate supply of good schools for the middle class, a proper distribution of them through the country, a thorough use of funds available for them, a right regulation of their studies, a due esteem of their importance, a due status for their teachers, a due security for those who use them, we shall never get in this way. We shall, in fact, be further off from it than ever; we shall be perpetuating all our present makeshifts. And this we have to set against the gain which a new school in Finsbury and half a dozen new schools elsewhere will bring us.[60]

Subscriptions and voluntary contributions organised by private individuals might be satisfactory when the number of schools was small, but such means would never be appropriate for funding and regulating an extensive country-wide system. This could only be accomplished by finance from the State.

v) Securities of Fitness: Inspection or Examinations?

Arnold also turned his attention to the question of supervision and inspection in a number of his writings. For example, in "'Porro Unum Est Necessarium'" (1878) he referred to a bill introduced by Dr. Lyon Playfair proposing to establish in England a Council of Public Instruction which would be empowered to inspect endowed schools and also non-endowed schools if the latter were willing to admit inspection. However, Arnold, though he spoke kindly of Playfair, was not particularly swayed by this bill for it did not go nearly as far as he himself would wish.[61] Playfair's inspection did, admittedly, signify some intervention by the State but in Arnold's opinion more inspection without a thorough going transformation of the whole body of secondary schools would not change the fact that England's middle class was "the worst schooled in civilised Europe." Rather, what was needed was the establishment of a complete system of State secondary schools. There should be passed for the secondary level an Act closely on the lines of the 1870 Elementary Education Act. The terms of such an act would require

> the provision throughout the country of a proper supply of secondary schools, with proper buildings and accommodations, at a proper fee, and with proper guarantees given by the teachers in the shape either of a university degree or of a special certificate for secondary instruction. An inquiry, as under that Act, would have to be made as to the fulfilment of the necessary conditions by the actual schools now professing to meet the demand for secondary instruction, and as to the correspondence of the supply of schools fulfilling those conditions with the supply fixed after due calculation as requisite.[62]

Naturally, there had to be some method of supervision under this State provision but whereas Playfair had favoured supervision by inspection in his system Arnold preferred supervision by examination.[63]

As he had observed earlier in his report for Taunton, the Prussian system was far superior to the French which over-inspected the *lycées*. For the Prussians resolved "inspection, for higher schools, mainly into a concert of the State with the school authorities in great examinations,--as effective a way of inspection, in real truth, as can be found." Certainly, there would be occasions in England when it would be necessary for special visits to be made to the secondary schools but the best method here would that they be made, as in Prussia, by members of the Provincial School Board or of the Central Council; there was no need nor was it wise to have a permanent body of school inspectors.[64]

Of course, when Arnold was recommending supervision of his proposed public secondary schools by examinations he was referring to examinations which were ultimately controlled by the State. Supervision by examination of the existing non State system was of little use. For example, he considered in *A French Eton* (1864) the securities of fitness provided by what he called the Oxford and Cambridge Middle Class Examinations but which were more commonly known as the Oxford and Cambridge Local Examinations. By means of these the two universities, from 1858 and at various localities throughout the country, examined boys at two levels, under fifteen (Cambridge stipulated sixteen) and under eighteen.[65] Though Arnold acknowledged that praise was indeed due to these examinations he still felt that their securities as presently composed were quite inadequate for ensuring the fitness of secondary schools. A major problem was that the promoters of these examinations accepted the low quality educational institutions existing throughout the nation, schools such as the "educational homes," and made no effort to inspect, criticize, or replace them. Rather, they had these institutions send their best pupils to local centres and then they examined them. Undoubtedly, Arnold admitted, there was some good in this but such examination of a limited number of select pupils was by no means what was signified by providing sufficient securities: "Any one can see that the examination of a few select scholars from a school, not at the school itself, not preceded or followed by an inspection of the school itself, affords no solid security for the good condition of their school."[66] For it was quite possible for an unscrupulous master to concentrate his attention on a small number of intelligent pupils who, passing the university examination, would act as a good advertisement for the school, but the majority of the pupils would be ignored, and there would be no procedure for revealing their general educational inadequacies. In short, the securities provided were insufficient. Consequently, he welcomed proposals for adding University inspection to the function of examining in the existing non-State system. As things now stood, adequate security would only come from adequate inspection. However, though he acknowledged that the Universities were fit institutions to undertake such inspection because of their undoubted weight and authority he was hesitant about their power actually to organize and carry it out:

> Can the Universities organise and pay a body of inspectors to travel all over England, to visit, at least once in every year, the four or five hundred endowed schools of this country, and its unnumbered "educational homes"; can they supply a machinery for regulating the action of these gentlemen, giving effect to the information received from them, printing their reports, circulating them

> through the country? The French University could; but the French university was a department of State. If the English Universities cannot, the security of their inspection will be precarious; if they can, there can be no better.[67]

But even if the Universities did succeed in furnishing sufficient security of inspection, Arnold doubted whether they could ever manage to provide a sufficient number of good schools. Despite inspection and examining the great number of woefully inadequate middle class schools would still remain.[68] An agency more powerful than the Universities was required, this, clearly, being the State. However, he implied in "'Porro Unum Est Necessarium'" (1878) that University examinations would be acceptable if they were generalised and regularised by State control and were then utilised by all secondary schools. The Universities would thus be merely an agency carrying out an important function of the State, and their examinations, being in reality State examinations, would satisfy inspection requirements.[69] However, the Oxford and Cambridge examinations continued in their present guise and Arnold was still to observe as late as June 1887 "that the local examinations supply us with neither the tests nor the supervision really requisite."[70]

In Chapter Five we considered Arnold's report of the Prussian educationist, Dr. L. Wiese who suggested that the problems besetting English education were due to the absence of a proper State system. Among his criticisms was the acceptance of the Universities as the agency for setting the standards in secondary schools and of the utilisation of their examinations as providing the guarantee of good school instruction. The case was different in Germany where the State itself assumed such functions. Moreover, Wiese believed that even if the English Universities managed to inspect the schools and conduct examinations they would still fail through want of power to bestow what was most needed in the schools, namely "unity of plan and a firm guiding hand." The fault lay in the voluntary nature of the system. It was up to the University to decide whether to inspect or not; similarly, the schools could accept or reject inspection just as they wished. Furthermore, the findings could be acted upon by the public or ignored. Consequently, declared Wiese, "We cannot look upon such an arrangement as supplying any effectual substitute for the official objectivity (die amtliche Objectivität) which attends the proceedings of a real independent school authority."[71] The authority desired by Wiese and, of course, also by Arnold was the State itself as was the case in Germany. Under a truly publ~~ic~~ system in England the Universities might still have a supervisory role to play, but given Arnold's preference it would most likely be one of examination rather than inspection and they would very clearly be acting as a mere agency of the State and not in any autonomous manner.

vi) Teachers

As we have seen in the previous chapter, Arnold was very impressed by the training, certification, and supervision of secondary teachers in certain foreign countries, practices which were in sharp contrast to the situation in England. However, he provided very few precise recommendations for reforming the training and status of English teachers, though in his 1887 "Schools in the Reign of Queen Victoria" he did furnish a few specific prescriptions. In this article he pinpointed registration as an important concern. But while he was willing to recognize every existing teacher over the age of fifty for the purposes of registration he was loath to do likewise for those younger. Rather, the latter "should either produce their titles or pass an examination." For the public was now ready, he believed, "for admitting that, in general, just as an apothecary ought not to practice without being registered and supplying proof of competency, so neither ought a schoolmaster." He therefore suggested that the College of Preceptors, founded in 1846, could be reconstituted "as a public normal school for secondary teachers--the true function for that useful College, and a most valuable and far-reaching one."[72] The graduates of such a public institution would give the requisite guarantees of fitness to teach in the new public schools. In this regard Arnold had clearly been struck by France's prestigious École Normale Supérieure which had provided many excellent lycée teachers who had fulfilled stringent conditions of training and examination."[73] Moreover, by its admirable work and reputation it had done much to raise the status of "the somewhat unattractive profession of schoolmaster."[74] Of course, most lycée teachers were not graduates of this institution, the number of students who could attend it being very limited. Still, the French authorities, under control of the Minister, laid down precise rules concerning the qualifications and experience required of those who would teach at each particular level in their secondary schools.[75]

Though he did not make any specific recommendations for some national examination for prospective secondary teachers it is possible that he would have liked some such body as the College of Preceptors under the jurisdiction of the Ministry to organise one. Certainly, he had looked favourably on the national AGRÉGATION examination in France, though a pass in this was only requisite for those who wished to become a full professor (PROFESSEUR TITULAIRE) in a lycée.[76] Similarly, he had been impressed by the Prussian STAATSPRÜFUNG, the examinations conducted by each of the seven High Examining Commissions, and which all prospective Gymnasien and Realschulen schoolmasters with few exceptions were obliged to pass before being issued with a "facultas docendi." It may be remarked here that while Arnold was clearly very concerned that teachers prove that they had received an adequate academic preparation for their profession, he said very little about pedagogical training. However, he found it of note that the Prussian STAATSPRÜFUNG included pedagogy among the subjects for examination and he suggested that a knowledge of this would be of use to English schoolmasters also:

> The Germans, as is well known, attach much importance to the science of pedagogic. That science is as yet far from being matured, and much nonsense is talked on the subject of it; still, the total unacquaintance with it, and with all which has been written about it, in which the intending schoolmaster is, in England, suffered to remain, has, I am convinced, injurious effects both on our schoolmasters and on our schools. [77]

At any rate, every year the Prussian Examining Commissions sent to the Provincial School Boards the results of the examinations for that province and would-be teachers with certificates in hand then applied to the School Board of the province where they wished to teach. "In certain exceptional cases candidates may be employed two half-years running without a certificate; but at the end of that time, if they have not passed the examination, they must be dismissed."[78] Of course, this examination had the signal benefit of ensuring that a high level of standardisation occurred among the teachers in each of the different Prussian School Boards just as the public system in France had resulted in teachers there being "of one stamp and training."[79] In short, Arnold recognized that the State in both France and Prussia kept a strict check over who could teach in their secondary schools [80], a practice which he regarded with favour and which he was very keen to see emulated in his proposed public schools in England. Indeed, he was convinced, as he pointed out in a letter to Baron Brightwell on February 3, 1864 that the teachers themselves would be the greatest benefactors of such a system: "No doubt, also, the public establishment of secondary institutions would confer the greatest benefit on the teachers of such schools, by providing for them a more definite position, better prospects of distinction and promotion if they are good and able men, and better means of training."[81]

vii) Curriculum

Arnold himself had been brought up in the traditional classical curriculum common in the great Public Schools and, as he remarked on a number of occasions, had received little exposure to mathematical or natural scientific subjects. Though he did not appear to have regretted this overmuch, especially as he had made consummate use of his classical education, he was well aware that the day had now arrived when such an exclusive curriculum would not suffice for the great numbers which he expected would soon be attending secondary schools. Nor did the middle class public itself always want such traditional subjects. Indeed, "The greatest lover of the classics must admit that the modern spirit shows a certain hostility to them." It was becoming more and more clear that "in the body of society there spreads a growing disbelief in Greek and Latin, at any rate as at present taught; a growing disposition to make modern languages and the natural sciences take their place." Arnold found this attitude prevalent not only in England but also in France and Germany, though he denied that it was the school authorities there who were responsible for it but the general public.[82] Nevertheless, in both of these countries the authorities, whether or not they agreed with this manifestation of the modern spirit, were still adapting their schools' organisation and curricula to meet its demand. In Germany the numerous Realschulen, public secondary institutions for those boys not intending to proceed to university, generally specialized in more modern and more immediately practical or useful subjects than the classical studies and the humanities favoured in the Gymnasien. Similarly, "in France, as elsewhere, an important sign of the times" was the increasing awareness that Latin and Greek could no longer maintain their dominant sway in the secondary school curriculum, with the result that the great majority of the lycées and almost all the communal colleges had a bifurcated curricular system with both classical and modern study programmes being offered. As he remarked in A French Eton(1864), comparing the official programme of studies for all French lycées with the general curriculum found in the Public Schools, "It has the scientific instruction and the study of the mother-tongue which our school-course is without, and is often blamed for being without."[83] Furthermore, as the century progressed these more "useful" subjects became more and more popular and common in schools abroad at the distinct expense of the classics and humanities. In his 1882 Preface to Higher Schools and Universities in Germany he observed: "There is, indeed, an increasing demand everywhere for modern or REAL studies, as they are called, and the school-course everywhere is being modified in compliance with this demand."[84] Indeed, four years earlier in "'Porro Unum Est Necessarium'" (1878) he had been most impressed by the increase in modern studies in French secondary schools:

> Let us note, in passing, that the modern or special instruction in these schools is constantly growing. The lycées are the stronghold of the classics; yet in the lycées the number of boys on the modern side had risen from 5002 at the end of 1865 to 8628 at the end of 1876, and the average number of such scholars for each lycée from 71 to 107. The teaching of the natural sciences, of the living languages, of geography, modern history, and literature, is being continually strengthened. The class of pupils receiving special preparation in the lycées for schools such as the Polytechnic, Saint Cyr, the Naval, Central, and Forest Schools, steadily increases. In the communal colleges the development of the modern side is much greater still, and is extremely remarkable. Of the 38,236 pupils in these colleges at the end of 1876, 9232 are little boys not yet going beyond primary instruction; of the remainder, 14,992 are on the classical side, and very nearly as many, 144,012, are on the modern. The number of teacherships for the modern languages has more than doubled in these colleges since 1865. [85]

It is true that in England also many of the private secondary schools to which Arnold was frequently hostile, specialized in the more modern or vocational subjects in response to demand from middle class parents. But he invariably felt that a question-mark hung over the teaching of such subjects in these schools for the usual reason, namely the absence of adequate securities of fitness of both teachers and matters taught. At least in France and Prussia there was public control over what was taught. In France the programme of studies laid down by the Minister was to be strictly followed by all public grammar schools, with the same class in the schools of all regions being taught the same lesson at the same time.[86] In Prussia ministerial authority fixed the Lehrplan and prescribed the matters of instruction and the time to be spent on them in each class. Though greater freedom was given to the teachers in the actual teaching of subjects in Prussian than in French schools, the Lehrplan was still "a regular, well-devised plan."[87] But, of course, no such programme existed for England's private secondary schools where a great diversity of studies characterized the curriculum. Indeed, Arnold believed, as he remarked in "Johnson's *Lives of the Poets*" (1878), that in his own country the view prevailed that education was "advanced in two ways principally: by for ever adding fresh matters of instruction, and by preventing uniformity."[88]

While Arnold in his prescriptions for secondary school reform did not set out a detailed curriculum which he desired should be taught in the public schools he did consider on many occasions the problem of whether the Classics and the humanities or the modern or "real" studies should have pride of place in the plan of school work. His main conclusion as set out in his report for the Taunton Commission seemed a balanced and reasonable one, namely that there was a place for both sides in the curriculum once the more vociferous partisans of each abated their respective "extreme pretensions." True to his notion of "culture" Arnold was arguing for a broad, truly liberating programme of studies, not a narrowly focused, straitening one. A student must have contact with as many points as possible of the circle of knowledge and not be content with just one part of its circumference, that is one who would be really educated should on no account concentrate on one branch of knowledge to the total exclusion of all others. The circle of knowledge implied an interrelationship and an "equipollency" between the studies of the humanists and those of the realists. Consequently, to gain vital knowledge one should have a grasp of both, though Arnold readily admitted that an individual, limited by his aptitudes, would naturally be obliged to emphasise some areas more than others:

> As our public instruction gets a clearer view of its own functions, of the relations of the human spirit to knowledge, and of the entire circle of knowledge, it will certainly more learn to awaken in its pupils an interest in that entire circle, and less allow them to remain total strangers to any part of it. Still, the circle is so vast and human faculties are so limited, that it is for the most part through a single aptitude, or group of aptitudes, that each individual will really get his access to intellectual life and vital knowledge; and it is by effectually directing these aptitudes on definite points of the circle, that he will really obtain his comprehension of the whole.[89]

But even with that concentration for which he is best suited by his particular aptitudes a student should be exposed to both humane letters and real studies in the curriculum.

But with respect to the Classics Arnold was in no doubt that great changes would have to be effected in their curricular content and in how they were generally taught. He believed, as did many other scholars since Erasmus, that the main problem with Greek and Latin as school subjects was that far too much stress was placed on the philological aspect, on grammar, accidence, syntax, with the result that students rarely went beyond linguistic analysis and gained little real knowledge of the great civilisation of the ancients, their art, their thought, their literature, their history. This was to fail totally in the teaching of the Classics. What was needed was to look to the German approach to these subjects, to see how they attempted to develop a broad ALTERTHUMSWISSENSCHAFT, that is "a knowledge of the spirit and power of Greek and Roman antiquity learned from its original works" rather than a mere superficial or, for that matter, thorough acquaintance with the philology of these languages.[90] As he declared on June 14, 1882 in his Rede lecture at Cambridge, "Literature and Science":

> When I speak of knowing Greek and Roman antiquity, therefore, as a help to knowing ourselves and the world, I mean more than a knowledge of so much vocabulary, so much grammar, so many portions of authors in the Greek and Latin languages. I mean knowing the Greeks and Romans, and their life and genius, and what they were and did in their world; what we get from them, and what is its value. That, at least, is the ideal; and when we talk of endeavouring to know Greek and Roman antiquity, as a help to knowing ourselves and the world, we mean endeavouring so to know them as to satisfy this ideal, however much we may still fall short of it.[91]

As he wrote in "The Study of Poetry" (1880), in theory the more elaborate philological foundation we make for reading the ancient authors the more we will be enabled to enjoy and understand them, but in practice, time being short in school, the great emphasis on the linguistic aspect of the Classics results in too little real knowledge and enjoyment being gained from them.[92] Moreover, this emphasis takes away that most important aspect of a classical education which, in his lecture to Eton schoolboys at a meeting of that College's Literary Society, he described as the facility "to conceive also that Graeco-Roman world, which is so mighty a factor in our own world, our own life, to conceive it as a whole of which we can trace the sequence, and the sense, and the connection with ourselves."[93]

In fine, Arnold recommended that for the great majority of boys taking Greek and Latin at school it would be far preferable if they studied these subjects with a view to the literature, as was the case with the study of modern languages like French, Italian, or German, rather than emphasising prose and poetic composition and linguistic scholarship. Indeed, John Stuart Mill, he asserted, had by independent reflection come to similar conclusions in his inaugural address at St. Andrews, though Arnold's own views had stemmed from "observation of the foreign schools and of the movement of ideas on the Continent."[94] Moreover, Arnold's recommendations that there be a diminution of grammatical studies and that a more literary analysis be introduced were accompanied, despite his own great regard for these subjects, by the suggestion that the dominance of Greek and Latin in the school curriculum be now questioned. This was in keeping with his belief that the movement of modern times was demanding a broadened programme of studies as constituting an important approach to the attainment of culture. Though most boys were still to learn Latin, Greek would not necessarily be compulsory. As he wrote to M.E. Grant Duff on May 24, 1864: "To give the means of learning Greek, for instance, but not to make Greek obligatory, is a proposal, for secondary education, which half the world are now prepared to prick up their ears if you make."[95] Another problem identified by Arnold was that the ancient universities insisted on a student passing an examination in Greek in order to matriculate. In a letter to the Vice Chancellor of Cambridge on June 18, 1879 he remarked: "In England we have no institution which answers to a German Polytechnicum. I should be glad if students following the mathematical or natural sciences could be admitted to the University by an examination without Greek, and could also take an honour degree in those Sciences by an examination without Greek."[96]

A somewhat decreased emphasis on the Classics would obviously provide more space on the curriculum for modern and real studies. Science, for example, should be taught from very early on in a child's educational career in common with the usual subjects of the elementary school. Arnold was not thinking of specific scientific subjects but what was called NATUR-KUNDE by the Germans, that is an understanding of the natural facts and laws. As he remarked in his 1878 Annual Report for Elementary Schools, "we are all coming to be agreed that an entire ignorance of the system of nature is as gross a defect in our children's education as not to know that there ever was such a person as Charles the First."[97] Then, as he recommended in Schools and Universities on the Continent (1868), study of the phenomena and laws of nature should continue in the lower classes of the secondary school, but it should be just one subject in the general curriculum along with English, Latin, modern languages, history, geography, arithmetic and geometry. Thus, for the first couple of years at the secondary level the programme of studies should be common so that all pupils would gain a sound foundation for a broad education. Only then would a pupil according to his aptitudes and aims be allowed to specialize in either the humanities or in science. Arnold was ambivalent about whether or not these two branches of knowledge should be taught in the same school. Certainly, as he observed in Schools and Universities on the

Continent (1868), the one school was advantageous because it was the more economical arrangement and also because there would then be less likelihood that a student of one would be judged as socially inferior to the student of the other. Though there had been an analogous bifurcated system within the same school in the French lycées Arnold considered that it had failed primarily "because the character of the one school remained so overwhelmingly humanistic, because the humanist body of teachers was in general much superior to the realist body, and because the claims of the humanities were allowed to pursue a boy so jealously into his REAL studies."[98] In Germany there were quite different types of school for different curricula. The Gymnasien were predominantly devoted to the humanities with relatively little attention paid to the natural sciences; in those places, however, where there was no Realschule the middle forms of the Gymnasium could teach the sciences. But generally the German system was a bipartite one with the humanities taught in one type of school and the sciences in another.[99] However, Arnold, despite his high regard for many aspects of the German system, at least in Schools and Universities on the Continent (1868) in which are contained his most extensive prescriptions for secondary school reform, did not seem to wish the curriculum in his proposed English secondary schools to be split into different institutions. Rather,

> The ideal place of instruction would be, I think, one where in the upper classes (the instruction in the lower classes having been the same for all scholars) both humanistic and REAL studies were as judiciously prosecuted, with as good teaching and with as generous a consideration for the main aptitudes of the pupil, as the different branches of humanistic study are now prosecuted in the best German Gymnasien.[100]

However, ten years later in "'Porro Unum Est Necessarium'" (1878) he appeared to change his mind and allow for two types of school: "A system of public intermediate schools we require to have throughout the country, of two grades, the classical side predominating in the schools of one grade, the modern side in the other."[101] Then, a year before his death, in "Schools in the Reign of Queen Victoria" (1887), he asserted quite specifically:

> Throughout the country good elementary schools, taking the child to the age of thirteen; then good secondary schools, taking him to sixteen, with good classical high schools and commercial high schools, taking him on further to eighteen or nineteen; with good technical and special schools, for those who require them, parallel with the secondary and high schools--this is what is to be aimed at. [102]

But, as far as I can judge, in no other writing, apart from the previous reference in "'Porro Unum Est Necessarium'" (1878) was Arnold so specific about the different types of school at the post-elementary level. Usually he was quite ambivalent and unclear and spoke generally of secondary and middle class schools. Certainly, as has been pointed out, it is impossible to construct a detailed blue-print for an Arnoldian system of post-elementary schools.

At any rate, the programme of studies in either the humanities or the sciences should not be too rigidly prescribed. "According to his aptitude, the pupil should be suffered to follow principally one branch of either of the two great lines of study; and, above all, to interchange the lines occasionally, following, on the line which is not his own line, such lessons as have yet some connection with his own line, or, from any cause whatever, some attraction for him."[103] Thus, specialization in one subject should not mean total ignorance of others. Still, the fact should be stressed that despite his own great love for the Classics and the humanities Arnold did allow that students could specialize in the sciences. Indeed, as he declared in his lecture "Literature and Science" (1882), "we must all admit that in natural science the habit gained of dealing with facts is a most valuable discipline, and that every one should have some experience of it."[104] It was only in points of detail and degree, contrary to popular mythology, that he differed in his debate with T.H. Huxley on the rival claims of literary and scientific subjects.

Arnold also desired that greater attention be paid in the curriculum to the chief modern languages. While it was common for the classical master in English schools also to teach modern languages, Arnold preferred the system in certain other countries where there were special teachers of these subjects. In Prussia, for example, a teacher of modern languages had to fulfil the requirements for gaining a special 'facultas docendi' before being allowed teach them. "This provision guards against the employment of subjects so unfit by their training and general attainments to rule a class, as those whom we too often see chosen as teachers of modern languages."[105] Even in France, Arnold observed in his report for Taunton, lessons in these languages were "better done,--with better methods, better teachers, and more thoroughly learned,--than in England," though the lessons in Germany were still better than in France.[106] The main benefit in studying modern languages in school, according to Arnold, did not reside in gaining the facility to speak them fluently. This was a mere vocational purpose for learning them, not a truly educational one. On the contrary, "It is as literature, and as opening fresh roads into knowledge, that the modern foreign languages, like the ancient, are truly school business; and far more ought to be done with them, on this view of their use, than has ever been done yet."[107] Thus, the rationale for studying modern languages was similar to that for studying the Classics.

A modern language which Arnold was very keen should be assiduously pursued in the secondary school was the mother tongue itself. But, in Arnold's day, English language and literature seldom figured to any appreciable degree as separate subjects at this level in England unlike the situation in France and Germany where the respective mother tongues were studied in all classes and were held in higher regard.[108] Indeed, thinking of the practice in French schools he wrote to John Conington, Oxford's Professor of Latin, from Paris in May 1865: "it is clear that Latin and Greek are cultivated almost entirely with a view to giving the pupil a mastery over his own language--a mastery which has always been the great object of intellectual ambition here, and which counts for more than a like mastery does with us. Perhaps, because it does not count for so much with us, a like mastery is, in fact, scarcely ever attained in England--certainly never at school."[109] But it was the study of literature, even more than language, for which there was such a need in English schools. This study would be a most effective agency for attaining that culture which was most urgently required throughout the society. Moreover, the literature of the mother tongue for obvious reasons would hold a very special place in the curriculum. As he wrote in "A Guide to English

Literature" (1877), "In literature we have present, and waiting ready to form us, the best which has been thought and said in the world. Our business is to get at this best and to know it well....The literature most accessible to all of us, touching us most nearly, is our own literature, English literature."[110] So it was now high time to include English as one of those points on the circle of knowledge of which a truly educated individual must have an acquaintance. The modern Zeitgeist had now signalled the end of those days when a knowledge of Latin and Greek alone indicated the mark of culture.

viii) Need for Connexion and Coordination in England's Public Educational System

Arnold by no means considered that his proposed secondary system should stand isolated from other educational levels. For the study of Continental practices revealed that the various elements of a complete educational system must not be treated as unrelated to each other but, on the contrary, "as parts of a regularly designed whole." Moreover, not only was it important that in the new public system the secondary schools be connected with those at the elementary level but also that they be closely joined to the post-secondary institutions: "Secondary and higher schools are to be closely connected with each other. Without good secondary schools you cannot have good universities; without good universities you cannot have good secondary schools."[111] There was to be coordination of all levels. As he declared in his General Report for 1878, the three levels "have to be in some measure co-ordered, and this teaches scale and proportion."[112] But good coordination of different levels was not everything; great care had also to be taken that a boy proceed into the appropriate grade of the next level. For it was no good, he declared, to have Continental type special schools of arts and trades and to enrol elementary school graduates "perfected by the Revised Code." For the study of the best Continental practices indicated "that the special school is the crown of a long co-ordered series, designed and graduated by the best heads in the country. A clever boy in a Prussian elementary school passes first into a MITTELSCHULE, or higher elementary school, then into a modern, or REAL, school of the second class, then into a REAL school of the first class, and finally, after all these, into the special school." Being thus prepared a boy is more likely to benefit from a special school, but "to send him there straight from the elementary school, is like sending a boy from the shell at one of our public schools to hear Professor Ritschl lecture on Latin inscriptions."[113]

The great necessity that a nation have good coordination of and connexion between all levels of education in one system received a long discussion in his 1885 Report on foreign elementary education for the Education Department. Here, he strongly criticized England for failing to have government control over more than the elementary level and for not coordinating elementary, secondary, and superior branches into one planned whole, as was the Continental practice. For example, in the Canton of Zurich there was an "organic connexion" between higher and lower education, the educational system being regarded as an organised whole.[114] In fact, almost two decades earlier in his Schools and Universities on the Continent (1868) he had lauded this connexion between the different levels of schools in Switzerland, and especially in Zurich: "Nowhere is the continuity between the primary and the higher schools so complete as in Canton Zurich."[115] An important reason for this was that all social classes in Switzerland tended to go to the same primary school thereby forming "a link in the chain of schools in which the middle and upper classes are educated."[116] Similarly, he observed in his 1885 Report, in Germany and France the State ensured that popular education was not left in isolation from the other levels. Rather, it was organized "as a part of one great system, a part in correspondence of some kind with the higher parts, and to be organized with the same seriousness, the same thorough knowledge and large views of education, the same single eye to its requirements, as the higher parts."[117] In short, what these foreign nations had was a thoroughly integral system, coordinating and connecting the various parts. Likewise, as we read in "German Letters on English Education," Germany had "the great advantage of having its schools co-ordered according to a regular, well-devised system, and their instruction laid according to a regular, well-devised plan."[118] In Italy, Arnold related with approval in Schools and Universities on the Continent (1868), the Superior Council of Public Instruction stressed that the kingdom should have one organic education law, "una legge universalmente accettata, e non derogata con provvedimenti transitori o particolari."[119] In short, what these foreign nations had was an integral system, with the various parts coordinated and connected. However, the situation was very different in England where only elementary education was under the aegis of the State and where there was no real contact between the different levels. Indeed, seventeen years later he could still observe, "The popular school in this country is at present considered by the Minister in charge of it not at all as one stage to be co-ordered with the other stages in a great system of public schools."[120]

Arnold also believed that while a public secondary educational system would, of course, be of immense benefit to the middle classes it would, in addition, greatly improve the elementary level, the important proviso being that there must be connexion between the different parts. Thinking in particular of the advantages to the elementary school he declared in his June 1886 lecture at the University of Pennsylvania, "Common Schools Abroad": "what is most to be desired for the common school is an ORGANIC CONNEXION, to borrow the phrase of the Zurich Constitution, with higher instruction,--a vivifying relation and contact with it. But for this purpose public instruction must be organized as one whole."[121] If there were no coordination between popular and higher instruction, however, then the former, Arnold held, would remain in an unsatisfactory condition.[122] Furthermore, the completely uncoordinated and discrete educational levels were proving to be a major handicap to the lower classes in that, under the existing provision, the vast majority of them were unable to proceed to one of the private secondary schools at the completion of primary school. Admittedly, the post-1870 School Boards, as we have seen, often provided advanced education in the elementary schools to compensate for the difficulty of attending secondary establishments. But this was a practice Arnold deplored. (supra p. 256) Certainly he wanted the working classes to avail themselves of good education, his faith in democracy having imbued in him the belief that the Populace should strive to attain upward social mobility and pass out into a higher class. But the best medium for effecting this was through public secondary schools which were part of one coordinated State-run system, and not through a prolongation of the elementary school. This was the case in the more egalitarian France where the appropriate State secondary schools, the second level in a coordinated public system, existed everywhere. As Arnold declared in his 1879 "'Ecce, Convertimur ad Gentes'":

> After all their losses, after all the milliards they have had to pay to Germany, the French have been laying out more and more in the last few years on their public secondary schools; and they do not seem so much worse off in their pecuniary condition at this moment than practical nations which make no such expenditure. At this very time a commission is sitting in France, to consider whether secondary instruction may not be brought into closer connection with elementary instruction than it is at present, by establishing schools more perfectly fitted than the present secondary schools to meet the wants of the best subjects who rise from the schools below.[123]

Something of this nature, Arnold was convinced, was also needed in England. While the foundations of a proper State elementary system were finally laid in 1870, government intervention at the higher educational levels had to wait until dates far in the future. But Arnold consistently affirmed that whenever the State got round to doing for secondary and higher education what it had done for the elementary level, it was essential that the three levels be linked in one integral system all under the one Minister and the one Education Department.

ix) Public Schools

Arnold, as we have seen, found the majority of England's private secondary schools to be contemptible, and in this he was at one with the general conclusions of the Taunton Commission. However, he was consistently quite favourable to that small number of Public Schools of great lineage which had been the subject of Lord Clarendon's Commission, two of which, indeed, he himself had attended. For these Public Schools, the educational bastions of the Barbarians, were, he felt, institutions of which England could be rightly proud. In fact, their students received "the best education the country can give,"[124] and he agreed with J.P. Mahaffy, Regius Professor of Greek at Trinity College, Dublin, who regarded the English Public Schools as being the best of their kind in Europe.[125] Likewise, late in his life, in his "Schools in the Reign of Queen Victoria" (1887), he lauded the nine schools examined by Clarendon, namely Eton, Winchester, Westminster, Harrow, Rugby, Shrewsbury, Charterhouse, St. Paul's, Merchant Taylors', as well as Marlborough and Wellington, which also figured in the Report, together with about twenty others which he did not name, as being "undoubtedly the best secondary schools of the country, and schools doing very good work."[126]

Of course, Arnold admitted that these Public Schools were not without faults. While the Battle of Waterloo may have been won on the playing-fields of Eton, "disasters have been prepared in those playing-fields as well as victories; disasters due to inadequate mental training--to want of application, knowledge, intelligence, lucidity."[127] Indeed, this lack of light was also the distinguishing feature which Arnold associated with the Barbarians in general. Moreover, this was not just Arnold's opinion, for the Clarendon Commission itself had reported that the academic climate of these schools left much to be desired.[128] But subject matter and academic content, Arnold acknowledged, were not the main concern of the parents who sent their boys to these schools. They paid the large fees to have their scions acquire a certain tone, polish, qualities of leadership--"a public spirit, a free spirit, a high spirit, a governing spirit."[129] But Arnold was just providing another instance of his "vivacity" when he had Arminius declare in Friendship's Garland (1871) that Public Schools were institutions where the rich send their boys for L250 per annum to "learn gentlemanly deportment and cricket." Nor was he truly serious when in the same work he discussed the somewhat less than academic career of the imaginary Lord Lumpington at Eton and the Rev. Esau Hittall at Charterhouse.[130] But he considered that the greatest problem with the Public Schools--and usually when he used this term he was referring to the very small number of very old endowed schools and not to those newer schools which came into prominence in the second half of the nineteenth century--was this very reason that they were so few and, consequently, educated only a tiny proportion of the nation's boys. As he wrote in The Popular Education of France (1861): "M. de Tallyrand truly said that the education of the great English public schools was the best in the world. He added, to be sure, that even this was detestable. But allowing it all its merits, how small a portion of the population does it embrace!"[131] Over two decades later Arnold could still observe that such establishments could provide only "for the fortunate and privileged few, but for the many, for the nation, [attendance was] ridiculously impossible."[132] However, during his work for the Newcastle Commission he had been struck by the fact that the State schools of France, communal colleges as well as lycées, were very plentiful and located all over France and were attended by very great numbers of middle class boys. These were "institutions which do not, indeed, give an education equal to that of our best public schools, but which extend to all the middle classes of France an education which our public schools give to the upper classes only."[133] Furthermore, Arnold was convinced that such an education was being provided not just by State schools in France but by those in other European countries also. As he observed in A French Eton (1864), these public secondary institutions on the Continent

> give to a whole new class--to the middle class taken at its very widest--not merely an education for whose teaching and boarding there is valid security, but something--not so much I admit, but something--of the same enlarging, liberalising sense, the sense of belonging to a great and honourable public institution, which Eton and our three or four great public schools give to our upper class only, and to a small fragment broken off from the top of our middle class. That is where England is weak, and France, Holland, and Germany are strong. [134]

In short, Arnold was quite satisfied with the general quality of the great Public Schools though he often stressed that they catered to only a tiny percentage of the nation's students and far fewer than the numbers attending the good public secondary schools abroad. What they did they did well and there was no immediate need to change them: "No wise man will desire to see root-and-branch work made with schools like Eton and Harrow, or to see them diverted from the function which they at present discharge, and, on the whole, usefully. Great subversive changes would here be out of place; it is an addition of new that our secondary instruction wants, not a demolition of old, or, at least, not of this old." New State secondary schools would have a stimulating effect on these old institutions, while the latter in turn would undoubtedly stimulate the former.[135] But if Arnold was generally willing to leave the Public Schools as they were he was also conscious that with the passage of time their importance would undoubtedly fade in response to the modern democratic Zeitgeist, just as he had perceived the power of the Barbarians, formerly England's rulers, to have also faded. As he wrote in his 1882 memoir on the former Eton schoolboy, Lieutenant Arthur Mynors who died of dysentery in South Africa during the Zulu War of 1879: "The order of things in which he was brought up, the school system in which he was educated, produce, not indeed many natures so sweet as his, but in all good natures many of his virtues. That school system is a close and narrow one; that order of things is changing, and will surely pass away. Vain are the endeavours to keep it fixed for ever, impotent are regrets for it; it will pass away."[136] At any rate, it was the multitude of private schools attended by great numbers of the middle classes which were in much more drastic need of being improved, not the small number of Public Schools which generally gave a satisfactory education and a certain spirit and tone to their students.[137] As he said of these latter schools in 1864: "But for the champions of the true cause of secondary instruction, for those interested in the thorough improvement of this most important concern, the centre of interest is not there."[138]

x) Liverpool Collegiate School and Dulwich College

Even though, as we have emphasized throughout this work, Arnold was a very staunch advocate of a State system of secondary schools, it is only fair to mention that there were at least two private schools, besides the Public Schools, with which he expressed satisfaction but which were not subject to State control. In his 1882 "A Liverpool Address" he argued that it was a misconception to hold that his understanding of public schools only embraced those which were "State-founded, State-paid, and State-regulated."[139] For he asserted that

> a man must be a fanatic on behalf of State interference--as some English people, perhaps, are fanatics in opposition to it--if he refuses to accept what meets his wishes in essentials because it does not bear a particular brand, and if he will not approve of a school as a public school unless the State makes and maintains it. For my part, I call a school public if I find it standing in the public eye, open to the wholesome influences of public opinion, and affording proper guarantees.[140]

Thus, according to these criteria Liverpool's Collegiate School, a proprietary school, must be recognized as a public school. It supplied the appropriate guarantees and, Arnold felt, even if the State were charged with overseeing secondary as it regulated elementary education it should not interfere with this institution as long as the guarantees were satisfactory. However, he was quite sure that it was impossible for a sufficient number of such schools to be established throughout the country, for only the State could supply the requisite quantity of secondary schools. Still, this article appears to be a major volte face by Arnold, since he seems to settle for something less than his customary advocacy of a pervasive State system at the secondary level. But, perhaps it is just an instance of realism coming to the fore, with Arnold after years of canvassing being practical enough to accept that in the complete absence of real State secondary schools an institution providing sufficient guarantees for its well-being could be termed "public" and left alone. Indeed, as we have seen, he invariably spoke highly of the great Public Schools for the prime reason that they also gave sufficient guarantees for their good standard and he had always acknowledged that they should be allowed to remain outside of his proposed public secondary system. But it now seemed as if Liverpool Collegiate School was being treated on the same level as these Public Schools. Nevertheless, it should be stressed that there were very few schools of a similar nature and his encomium of it should not signify any substantial watering down of his demand for a State system of public secondary schools.

Three years later he also gave great praise to another private school, Dulwich College, which after two centuries in the doldrums, was revived and by any standards attained a high level of excellence. It was a day school, catering in particular to London's middle and lower middle classes, and was accordingly quite different from most of the Public Schools. But Arnold liked it and considered that if there had been instituted a public secondary school system, then it would have been a good thing for the schools to be modelled on the Dulwich pattern. For "Dulwich is the very type of the schools which the English middle classes, had they and their politicians been wise, would, I think, in their day of power, which is now, perhaps, passing from them, have endeavoured to institute for themselves everywhere."[141] But now, in 1885, Arnold seemed very pessimistic about the possibility of there being instituted throughout England a public system of schools like Dulwich, and he regretted "that it should be so, but such is the case."[142] Still, this lecture and "A Liverpool Address" reveal that there were at least two schools for middle class boys, Liverpool Collegiate School and Dulwich College, with which Arnold was pleased and which, together with those on the Continent, he would have welcomed as models for his proposed public system.

B) Arnold's Prescriptions for Third Level Educational Reform

We have seen in Chapter Five that Arnold, despite his undoubted interest in England's higher education, and particularly the University of Oxford, wrote comparatively little about this level of education. THe University of Durham was hardly mentioned and the University of London, though respected by Arnold, received little attention. In addition, though he was assuredly aware of the reforms the two ancient universities were undergoing we get little inkling of them from his writings. Furthermore, though he desired, as we shall see, that increased accessibility to higher education be made available in the provinces, he made little mention of the various non-university institutions (some of which were the embryos of the later civic universities) which were proliferating in provincial cities during the second half of the century. He did, however, concern himself with Liverpool University College (and mentioned Owens College, Manchester) in his 1882 "A Liverpool Address." Still, he insisted in a small number of writings that England's higher education had to be reformed. Moreover, this was particularly important as the middle classes were partaking to an increasing extent of this level of education. If one of his main convictions stemming from his comparative educational experiences on the Continent was the need for the establishment of a thorough public secondary educational system as one of the main agencies for reforming England's middle classes, there was also inculcated in him the realisation that these classes required increased access to higher educational institutions at the completion of their secondary education. Moreover, he was not too happy about the number and about the general standard of those institutions which were already in existence. Indeed, in Schools and Universities on the Continent (1868) he averred that English superior instruction was "in the opinion of the best judges, the weakest part of our whole educational system, and we must not hope to improve effectually the secondary school without doing something for the schools above it, with which it has an intimate natural connection."[143] Accordingly, in this report he drew valuable lessons from what he had seen of the third level instruction of France, Italy, Germany, and to a lesser extent Switzerland, and made a number of wide ranging suggestions for improving such instruction in England. These recommendations besides revealing how indebted he was to his experiences of educational practices on the Continent also displayed, if not his causal influence, at least his gift for prophecy. In addition, a few other suggestions were scattered in some of his other writings, most notably in his 1882 "A Liverpool Address."

University education was not the only form of education which Arnold wished to see changed. He was also concerned about the lack of special schools in England. In Schools and Universities on the Continent (1868) he declared that it "is the function of the special school to give a professional direction to what a boy has learnt at the secondary school, at the same time that it makes his knowledge, as far as possible, systematic,--and developes it into science." But the problem in England was that special schools of the variety Arnold had witnessed on the Continent were not yet instituted.[144] Moreover, the nation was suffering badly, he believed, by their absence and this was especially so in the spheres of applied science and engineering.[145] However, special schools where a student could be instructed in some particular profession were common on the Continent. For example, Prussia had its GEWERBE-INSTITUT and its BAUAKADEMIE or School of Architecture at Berlin, and its Polytechnicum at Stuttgart while Switzerland had its Polytechnicum for all sorts of technical instruction.[146] But it was France where special schools were particularly prominent and Arnold was suitably impressed. In this country were a number of State establishments under the jurisdiction of the Minister of Public Instruction such as the College of France, the École des Chartes, the Museum of Natural History, the School of Living Oriental Languages, the School of Athens. Other ministeries had jurisdiction over special schools also. The Polytechnic, Saint Cyr, and the Cavalry School of Saumur were under the Minister of War, the Naval School and the Schools of Hydrography under the Minister of Marine, the School of Woodcraft under the Minister of Finance, the School of Fine Arts under the Minister of the Household, the Schools of Agriculture, of Veterinary, of Arts and Trades, the Central School of Arts and Manufactures, the

School of Commerce, the Schools of Mines and Miners, and the Imperial School of Bridges and Roads under the Minister of Agriculture, Commerce, and Public Works.[147] These were the sort of public higher educational establishments which, Arnold felt strongly, were urgently needed by England to supplement the work of the existing universities. They would set a standard of accepted study in the different disciplines, provide a systematic and professional training and fit their students for appropriate employment. In so doing they would help to raise the whole intellectual level of the nation.

Moreover, thinking of the Civil Service examinations, Arnold asserted that attendance at special schools or universities would be much better than the usual English practice of cramming for single examinations for civil employment without first having undergone a good course of study. Examinations had their uses but only "in strict subordination to this better and ampler security," namely that candidates should "have received for a certain length of time the best instruction" beforehand. "Then, and not till then, may come in, as a confirmatory and supplementary test, a rationally regulated civil service examination."[148] He had been particularly struck by the very lackadaisical training received by pharmacists and lawyers in England compared with their counterparts on the Continent where appropriate courses of instruction had to be undergone and examinations passed by students before they were allowed to practice their professions.[149] But the most important aspect of this recommendation was that prospective employees should have attended a suitable course of superior instruction rather than merely have passed some examination.

Knowledge was not to be gained just by cramming. Moreover, he considered that such a scheme would have some very worthwhile benefits besides merely selecting employees, if a letter to the Pall Mall Gazette, printed October 5, 1870 is indeed his:

> Such a plan, if possible, would give a considerable additional value to the certificate to be gained at the place of education. A degree, for example, would have a recognized and definite value; very many young men, besides those who actually intended to enter the service, would like to obtain the qualification; it would be a strong motive for many youths to enter the universities who now cut short their education at an earlier period; and the stimulus thus created would not, as at present, be confined to the few who compete, but would have a direct influence upon the whole education system. If certain recognized certificates, to be obtained by a given course of instruction, implied eligibility to certain public offices, the instruction would, of course, gain in commercial value. Some of the worst tendencies of the cramming system would be neutralized. It would not longer be the interest of the tutor or schoolmaster to select a few youths and train them in the art of catching marks; but he would be strongly induced to work up the whole of his pupils to a definite standard.[150]

At any rate, on the Continent students before proceeding to Civil Service type examinations were prepared by first-rate instruction given by first-rate professors at special or superior schools and in the process of gaining the appropriate special knowledge they were also "formed," that is truly educated.[151] Accordingly, with the graduates of these foreign institutions taking up responsible positions in their nations' civil structure it was no wonder that the intellectual life of their societies was furthered. On the other hand, the hit-and-miss education, as Arnold viewed it, of England's analogous civil employees was a major factor in keeping that nation's intellectual development and modernity languishing behind her foreign neighbours. For it was a prime advantage of public higher educational institutions, he declared, that

> They represent the State, the country, the collective community, in a striking visible shape, which is at the same time a noble and civilising one; giving the people something to be proud of and which it does them good to be proud of. The State is in England singularly without means of civilisation of this kind. But a modern State cannot afford to do without them, and the action of individuals and corporations cannot fully compensate for them; the want of them has told severely on the intelligence and refinement of our middle and lower class.[152]

Arnold did mention in Schools and Universities on the Continent (1868) the Science and Art Department which opened in South Kensington in 1853 and, though he himself knew little of it, he declared that it had aroused strong interest on the Continent especially because of the effect it had had on England's industry. Moreover, abroad it had resulted in the "conviction that in the mere interests of this industry we should be obliged to go on and give to this idea of a special school greater development." Arnold himself had a similar conviction: "I, too, believe that we must have a system of special schools; but this is a subject which well deserves a separate study, and some one to treat it who is better qualified for the business than I am."[153] Consequently, he proffered no details how such institutions should be set up and organised.

It should be stated that reading Arnold we get the impression that there was hardly any post-elementary education in England other than the various secondary schools and universities. It is true that at the time of Schools and Universities on the Continent (1868) England had indeed few, if any, institutions which could be termed special schools in Arnold's sense of the notion, and certainly fewer than some Continental nations had. But before Arnold's death a number of institutions were established which catered to demands for further education; some even were in existence before 1868. As a few examples we may mention the Royal College of Chemistry which was established in 1845 as well as the Government School of Mines and Science which was founded six years later. The City and Guilds Institute was opened in 1880 as a result of interest which stemmed from the 1875 Report of the Devonshire Commission. This Institute was directly responsible for the Finsbury Technical College which came into being in 1883 and for the City and Guilds Central Technical College at South Kensington in the following year. Similar institutions were founded in other parts of the country especially in the industrial towns of the North. The 1880s witnessed the setting up of the "polytechnics," institutions of both general and special education, which in many respects were the successors of the mechanics' institutes. While the above, and others which could be mentioned, were not the sort of special schools desired by Arnold they did indeed offer opportunities for further education other than that of the Universities and University Colleges.

With respect to university education Arnold, despite his conviction that Oxford and Cambridge had manifest inadequacies, firmly believed that the most important changes were not to be accomplished at these ancient universities. Furthermore, increasing access to university did not necessarily imply some arrangement whereby students would come to reside at one of these universities for a shortened period, even as little a one month. For, as he asserted, "one thing which my foreign experience has left me convinced of" was that instruction must be brought to the students, and not vice versa. His plan was to

> plant faculties in the eight or ten principal seats of population, and let the students follow lectures there from their own homes, or with whatever arrangements for their living they and their parents choose. It would be everything for the great seats of population to be thus made intellectual centres as well as mere places of business; for the want of this at present, Liverpool and Leeds are mere overgrown provincial towns, while Strasbourg and Lyons are European cities.[154]

France, at the time of the Taunton Commission, did not have distinct universities like Oxford and Cambridge. Rather, the nation was divided into eighteen academies, in sixteen of which were faculties each with varying numbers of chairs. Not every academy had all five faculties; only letters and sciences were in each. Theology was in seven, law was in eleven, with medicine in three. Even large towns with no seat of a faculty of letters and sciences could establish auxiliary institutions where students could attend lectures which could be counted under certain restrictions as faculty lectures.[155] It is important to note that the faculties were not connected with each other, but each had the power to examine for and to grant degrees. In Prussia there were six complete universities each with the faculties of theology, law, medicine, and philosophy at Berlin, Bonn, Breslau, Greifswald, Halle, and Königsberg and two incomplete universities with only theology and philosophy at Münster and Braunsberg.[156] Even Italy had fifteen universities, though Arnold considered that this was too many to fill with first-rate professors.[157] At any rate, he was stressing that European nations unlike England had seats of higher education spread throughout their country.

In the new eight or ten centres, in London and the provinces, where faculties were to be established, Arnold recommended that Oxford and Cambridge should locate a number of their professors, still keeping the title of professors of these ancient universities. They would thereby contribute to "unite things new and old, and help in the happiest manner to inaugurate a truly national system of superior instruction." Moreover, some of the Oxford and Cambridge emoluments could go towards endowing professorial chairs and student exhibitions in these centres.[158] Years later in "A Liverpool Address" (1882) Arnold suggested that the State should assign some Regius Professorships to institutions like Liverpool University College and Owens College, Manchester.[159] This was all in keeping with his fervent desire that higher education must rest on a sound foundation of superior instruction as his comparative educational experiences revealed to him existed in Prussia. At any rate, the "design should be, to form centres of superior instruction in at least ten different parts of England, with first-rate professors to give this instruction."[160] For Arnold was insistent that the main function of a university was not merely to examine or to confer degrees. Much more valuable was "to bring young men into personal contact with teachers of high mental gifts and high attainments, and to raise and form the pupil by that contact."[161] (It is interesting that Arnold, as far as I can judge, never referred to the University Extension Movement started by Cambridge in 1873 and followed by London in 1876 and Oxford in 1878. This was a programme whereby academics from these universities would travel to other towns, especially in the North, and lecture on various subjects to working and middle class audiences.) The teachers or professors should be grouped into faculties, each with a dean. They would then concert, "as the professors and PRIVATDOCENTEN of a faculty concert in Germany, their instruction together" thereby acting, unlike Oxford and Cambridge where professors were not formed into faculties, as real universities.[162] It was very important that this should also be effected at the University of London for which Arnold had some admiration--as he declared in the second of his lectures "On Translating Homer" (1860), this was "an institution which by its position and by its merits acquires every year greater importance," and in his 1882 "A Liverpool Address," "I regard the London University with great respect."[163] It

> should be re-cast and faculties formed in connection with it, in order to give some public voice and place to superior instruction in the richest capital of the world; and for this purpose the strangely devised and anomolous organisations of King's College and University College should be turned to account, and CO-ORDERED, as the French say, with the University of London. Contributions from Oxford and Cambridge, and new appointments, might supply what was wanting to fill the faculties, which in London, the capital of the country, should, as at Paris or Berlin, be very strong. London would then really have, what it has not at present, a university.[164]

Arnold did not consider that each of the eight or ten centres containing faculties should have the power of examining for and of conferring degrees. From his observations in Germany he had concluded that too many universities in that nation granted degrees and that there was a distinct lack of standardisation among these awards. It would be sufficient if in England only Oxford, Cambridge, and the University of London were examining boards with the power of granting degrees; each of the centres throughout the country would be connected with one or other of the boards and the students of that faculty would take that board's degree examinations.[165]

Just as England's new secondary educational system was to be public so also, in Arnold's opinion, were the reorganised higher educational institutions to be under the jurisdiction of the State. This was the case in the countries he had visited on the Continent. Nevertheless, he did not want excessive control and this was precisely what he found to be wrong with higher education in France. Despite the undoubted benefits resulting from France's system being spread throughout the country, Arnold believed that there was too much regulation by the Ministry and the State there. He preferred the situation in Prussia where the Minister of Public Instruction had indeed a great deal of authority over the universities but where they were still much more autonomous than in France. "The French," Arnold observed, "...are naturally most struck with the liberty of the German universities, and it is in liberty that they have most need to borrow from them."[166] Still, it was excessive interference by the State which Arnold was against not, by any means, all involvement by the State. Consequently, his proposed reorganisation of England's higher educational system was to be under an Education Minister and a Superior Council of Public Instruction. "It is not from any love of bureaucracy that men like Wilhelm Von Humboldt, ardent friends of human dignity and liberty, have had recourse to a department of State in organising universities, it is because an Education Minister supplies you, for the discharge of certain critical functions, the agent who will perform them in the greatest blaze of daylight and with the keenest sense of responsibility."[167] The sort of arrangement Arnold desired would be on the lines he had witnessed in Prussia: "Following the Prussian division of school interests into EXTERNA and INTERNA, trustees might remain charged with EXTERNA, the management of property; while INTERNA, the appointment of professors and the organisation of faculties, devolved upon the Education department."[168]

Arnold also recommended that the State should, if necessary, help the organisation of the centres of faculties with a public grant. Of course, he recognized that English Universities were already in receipt of money from the State. As he observed in A French Eton (1864): "The Universities receive public grants; for--not to speak of the payment of certain professors by the State--that the State regards the endowments of the Universities as in reality public grants, it proves by assuming to itself the right of interfering in the disposal of them."[169] With regard to Oxford and Cambridge endowments "the nation assigns, regulates, and in some cases withdraws them."[170] Yet, it seems as if Arnold wished that the financial involvement of the State in English universities be more lavish and more organized, as it was on the Continent where, at the time of the Taunton Commission, Italy was by far the leader in government spending on universities, followed by France, and then by Prussia.[171] It is true that he believed that the towns chosen to contain the new faculties "would furnish an annual contribution to the expenses of the faculties" [172] and that in 1882 he praised University College, Liverpool for garnering its finance from local rather than State resources: "If we are to desire public endowment, you have by the grant of your municipality public endowment in that very form in which it is best for schools--in the form of local and municipal endowment. A municipal grant proves more surely than a State grant that a local want is genuine." However, the main reason that he considered that the Liverpool institution had done better from local rather than central help was his belief that if there had been greater involvement by the State the College would have become a mere examination board like London rather than a real teaching institution as he considered it to be.[173] Six years later The Bristol Times and Mirror, on March 9, 1888, shortly before his death, reported on his speech in support of an endowment fund for Bristol University College: "He hoped the College would get over the difficulties that were besetting it, and if anything could be done to induce the Government to give aid to Colleges of this sort, one of the endeavours of his life would be gratified, and a very great benefit would be conferred on the whole of the community (applause)."[174] It is manifest that, just as he desired for public secondary schools, Arnold wished that State involvement in higher education in England should extend to more than certain regulatory functions--it should help with financing also.

In short, Arnold considered that higher education should be placed under more State control and at the same time be greatly extended and thoroughly reorganised, the changes being based in many respects on Continental models, especially that of Prussia. This would be a most cogent agency for helping to transform the English middle classes and to lead England to true modernity. Undoubtedly, secondary education was deemed more important, particularly in terms of numbers of the middle classes who would be directly affected, but higher educational institutions would assist them in setting a standard of lucidity at which these classes would aim in their quest for an "intellectual deliverance":

> To generate a spirit of lucidity in provincial towns, and among the middle classes, bound to a life of much routine and plunged in business, is...difficult. Schools and universities--universities with serious studies, with disinterested studies, universities connecting these studies the one with the other, and continuing them into the years of manhood--are in this case the best agency we can use. It may be slow, but it is sure. [175]

Moreover, it was an agency which was ultimately under a central Minister and a Superior Council of Public Instruction, notwithstanding its distinct local control. Thus, it was Arnold’s firm conviction that all levels of education in England--elementary, secondary, higher--were, as on the Continent, to be the province of the State.

REFERENCES

1. *A French Eton*, *Prose Works* 2:295.

2. Ibid., pp. 296-297. Arnold did indeed mention attributes with which his proposed secondary schools should be furnished. As he wrote in "'Ecce, Convertimur ad Gentes'": "By the establishment of public schools for the middle classes, I mean an establishment of the same kind as we now have for popular education. I mean the provision by law, throughout the country, of a supply of properly guaranteed schools, in due proportion to the estimated number of population requiring them; schools giving secondary instruction, as it is called,--that fuller and higher instruction which comes after elementary instruction,--and giving it at a cost not exceeding a certain rate." ("'Ecce, Convertimur ad Gentes,'" *Prose Works* 9:13).

3. *Schools and Universities on the Continent*, *Prose Works* 4:316.

4. Ibid., p. 314.

5. *A French Eton*, *Prose Works* 2:302.

6. Ibid., p. 228.

7. "A First Requisite for Church Reform," Letter to the Editor of the *Pall Mall Gazette*, May 30, 1870, *Prose Works* 6:131.

8. *Schools and Universities on the Continent*, *Prose Works* 4:228-229.

9. See "Common Schools Abroad," *Prose Works* 11:102-103.

10. "Thirty-five Years of School Inspecting: Mr. Matthew Arnold's Farewell," Appendix I of *Prose Works* 11:378 (originally in *The Times*, November 13, 1886, p. 5, cols. 5-6).

11. "Schools in the Reign of Queen Victoria," *Prose Works* 11:245.

12. However, in "'Porro Unum Est Necessarium'" he claimed to discern certain problems with the Council of Public Instruction in France which hindered its consultative function: "The function of a council is consultative: to consider and advise as to methods and studies. The function is a very important one. But a Council of Public Instruction is generally a body framed so as to represent several great interests. It is so in France, at any rate. And the consequence is, I believe, that instead of there being much consideration of school methods and studies, the interests generally break out and begin a war, religious, professional, or administrative, amongst themselves; and the minister finds it expedient to convoke and consult his council as little as possible." ("'Porro Unum Est Necessarium,'" *Prose Works* 8:367).

13. *Schools and Universities on the Continent*, *Prose Works* 4:315.

14. Ibid.

15. Ibid., pp. 93-94.

16. A French Eton, Prose Works 2:307-308.

17. "My Countrymen," Prose Works 5:21.

18. "'Ecce, Convertimur ad Gentes,'" Prose Works 9:12. See also "'Porro Unum Est Necessarium,'" Prose Works 8:367-368.

19. The Popular Education of France, Prose Works 2:34.

20. "After the Elections," Prose Works 11:84-85. Five days later in a letter to M.E. Grant Duff Arnold seemed perhaps a little optimistic about the advent of the system he so desired: "And now, unless the Conservatives let things drift and miss their opportunity, we have a really interesting and fruitful political work before us--the establishment of a thorough system of local government." (Letter to Sir Mountstuart Grant Duff, July 29, 1886, Russell, Letters 2:340).

21. Letter to his sister Fan, July 11, 1886, Ibid., p. 337. See also Letter to his sister K (Jane Martha), July 8, 1886, Ibid., p. 335. Ten months later in "Up to Easter" he wrote: "Whoever has had occasion to learn the course of public business in foreign countries, knows what we lose for want of proper local government in Great Britain....The best thing I have observed in New England is the effect of the training in local government upon the average person there. With us, little is known of systems of local government, and there is no cry for the thing; to discredit it, to throw out the scoff of THE HEPTARCHY, is easy enough. But it is unpatriotic and unwise." ("Up to Easter," Prose Works 11:205). See also "The Zenith of Conservatism," Prose Works 11:128; also "A Word More about America," Prose Works 10:209-212.

22. "The Nadir of Liberalism," Prose Works 11:68.

23. "The Zenith of Conservatism," Prose Works 11:127.

24. See "'Ecce, Convertimur ad Gentes,'" Prose Works 9:7; also "A Word More about America," Prose Works 10:210.

25. "The Nadir of Liberalism," Prose Works 11:76.

26. "Schools in the Reign of Queen Victoria," Prose Works 11:244.

27. "'Ecce, Convertimur ad Gentes,'" Prose Works 9:12.

28. "Irish Catholicism and British Liberalism," Prose Works 8:346.

29. Reports on Elementary Schools, ed. Sandford, p. 233.

30. Schools and Universities on the Continent, Prose Works 4:306. See

also "A Speech at Westminster," Prose Works 7:87; also "'Ecce, Convertimur ad Gentes,'" Prose Works 9:12.

31. Schools and Universities on the Continent, Prose Works 4:306-307.

32. A French Eton, Prose Works 2:297. See also "My Countrymen," Prose Works 5:6.

33. See for example, Schools and Universities on the Continent, Prose Works 4:138; Culture and Anarchy, Prose Works 5:162; "'Ecce, Convertimur ad Gentes,'" Prose Works 9:15.

34. Schools and Universities on the Continent, Prose Works 4:316.

35. Ibid., pp. 200-202.

36. Ibid., p. 197.

37. Ibid., p. 275. Earlier, in his article "The Twice-Revised Code," published in Fraser's Magazine in March 1862, he had been quite specific about what he considered to be the respective duties of the State and of local bodies regarding elementary education: "The State's proper business in popular education, is to help in the creation and maintenance of the schools necessary; to cause fit local bodies to be appointed with the function of watching over these schools; and, finally, itself to exercise over these bodies and their performance of their functions, a general supervision. When it goes far beyond this, when it makes its aid a system of prizes requiring the most minute and detailed examinations; when it tries to test the acquirements of every individual child to whose instruction it contributes, it goes beyond its province; it invests itself with municipal, not imperial, functions, it creates an administrative expenditure which is excessive." ("The Twice-Revised Code," Prose Works 2:230-231).

38. A French Eton, Prose Works 2:294.

39. Ibid., p. 295.

40. Schools and Universities on the Continent, Prose Works 4:53-55.

41. Ibid., pp. 316-317.

42. "My Countrymen," Prose Works 5:21.

43. In his 1887 "Schools in the Reign of Queen Victoria" Arnold quoted from this Report: "'there are few endowments applicable to secondary education which are put to the best use, and very many which are working to little or bad use.'" ("Schools in the Reign of Queen Victoria," Prose Works 11:240).

44. Schools and Universities on the Continent, Prose Works 4:317.

45. "Schools in the Reign of Queen Victoria," Prose Works 11:242.

46. Letter to his mother, June 18, 1869, Russell, Letters 2:13.

47. "Schools in the Reign of Queen Victoria," Prose Works 11:242. As R.H. Super declared, the distinction between "private" and "proprietary" school was explained by the Taunton Commission: "The Commission defined a 'private' school as one conducted by the schoolmaster on his own account, a 'proprietary' school as the property of an individual or company (including a religious organisation) that appoints and supervises the schoolmaster." [Prose Works 11:452 (notes)].

48. Reports on Elementary Schools, ed. Sandford, p. 247.

49. A French Eton, Prose Works 2:284-285.

50. "'Porro Unum Est Necessarium,'" Prose Works 8:366.

51. A French Eton, Prose Works 2:285.

52. Ibid., p. 295.

53. Ibid., pp. 286-287.

54. Special Report (1886), Prose Works 11:16; see also pp. 7, 13.

55. First Report of The Royal Commission on the Working of the Elementary Education Acts, England and Wales (Cross Commission Report), British Parliamentary Papers, Education General (Shannon, Ireland: Irish University Press, 1970), 34:202.

56. Reports on Elementary Schools, ed. Sandford, p. 220.

57. Ibid., p. 222.

58. Ibid., p. 223.

59. A French Eton, Prose Works 2:288.

60. "The Mansion-House Meeting," Letter to the Editor of the Pall Mall Gazette, Prose Works 4:11-12.

61. In two letters to Thomas Humphrey Ward dated October 26 and October 30, 1878 Arnold used the attributes "very insufficient" and "perfectly inadequate" respectively to describe Playfair's Bill. [Letters to Thomas Humphrey Ward, October 26 and 30, 1878, The A.K. Davis-Matthew Arnold Collection, Univ. of Virginia Library, No. 4885, Box 19 (with the help of Ms. Kirsch's transcript)].

62. "'Porro Unum Est Necessarium,'" Prose Works 8:365-366.

63. Ibid., p. 365.

64. Schools and Universities on the Continent, Prose Works 4:316.

65. Prose Works 2:376.

66. A French Eton, Prose Works 2:289. See "Education and Competition," Letter to the Editor of the Pall Mall Gazette, October 5, 1870, Prose Works 6:414.

67. A French Eton, Prose Works 2:289.

68. Ibid., p. 290.

69. "'Porro Unum Est Necessarium,'" Prose Works 8:365.

70. "Schools in the Reign of Queen Victoria," Prose Works 11:243.

71. "German Letters on English Education," Prose Works 8:211.

72. "Schools in the Reign of Queen Victoria," Prose Works 11:244.

73. A French Eton, Prose Works 2:267. See also Schools and Universities on the Continent, Prose Works 4:69-71.

74. Ibid., p. 82.

75. Ibid., pp. 65 et seq..

76. Ibid., pp. 65-67.

77. Ibid., p. 220. Later, in his 1874 "A Speech at Westminster," Arnold declared that "the science of teaching is still in its infancy." ("A Speech at Westminster," Prose Works 7:88).

78. Schools and Universities on the Continent, Prose Works 4:221; see also pp. 218-222.

79. Ibid., p. 86.

80. See also Ibid., p. 195; "'Porro Unum Est Necessarium,'" Prose Works 8:354.

81. Letter to Baron Brightwell, Esq.., February 3, 1864, The A.K. Davis-Matthew Arnold Collection, Univ. of Virginia Library, No. 4885, Box 14 (with the help of Ms. Kirsch's transcript).

82. Schools and Universities on the Continent, Prose Works 4:120,127.

83. A French Eton, Prose Works 2:269.

84. Preface to Higher Schools and Universities in Germany (1882), Prose Works 4:31.

85. "'Porro Unum Est Necessarium,'" Prose Works 8:354-355.

86. See The Popular Education of France, Prose Works 2:268; Schools and Universities on the Continent, Prose Works 4:60, 76.

87. Ibid., p. 190 et seq.. See also "German Letters on English Education," Prose Works 8:210.

88. "Johnson's Lives of the Poets," Prose Works 8:307. In "A Guide to English Literature" (1877) Arnold wrote: "For myself, I lament nothing more in our actual instruction than its multiformity,--a multiformity, too often, of false direction and useless labour. I desire nothing so much for it as greater uniformity,--but uniformity in good." ("A Guide to English Literature," Prose Works 8:237).

89. Schools and Universities on the Continent, Prose Works 4:291.

90. Ibid., p. 294; also p. 242.

91. "Literature and Science," Prose Works 10:57-58.

92. "The Study of Poetry," Prose Works 9:165-166.

93. "A Speech at Eton," Prose Works 9:23.

94. Schools and Universities on the Continent, Prose Works 4:298.

95. Letter to M.E. Grant Duff, May 24, 1864, Russell, Letters, 1:233. Greek did not hold such a prominent place in the French lycées as it did in the English Public Schools. (See Schools and Universities on the Continent, Prose Works 4:113; "Sainte-Beuve," Prose Works 11:108).

96. Letter to the Rev. the Vice Chancellor of Cambridge, June 18, 1879 The A.K. Davis-Matthew Arnold Collection, Univ. of Virginia Library, No. 4885, Box 20 (with the help of Ms. Kirsch's transcript).

97. Reports on Elementary Schools, ed. Sandford, p. 206. This year's report contains a number of recommendations for improving the elementary school curriculum. Arnold made clear what he meant by NATUR-KUNDE in his evidence before the Cross Commission on April 7, 1886: "It is what used to be called in England natural philosophy. I am guided very much by what I see; and I see that it works extremely well in Germany, to have the elements of what we should call natural philosophy judiciously taught in the lower classes rising in the higher classes to physics and physiology, and really good scientific teaching; but the teaching is extremely gradual, and excellent from that reason. Even I could follow it. In listening to a lesson in electricity, about which I know nothing, to girls in Berlin I thought, "If I had been taught like this I could have known all these things that I am ignorant of." (First Report of Royal Commission, British Parliamentary Papers, Education General 34:209-210).

98. Schools and Universities on the Continent, Prose Works 4:301.

99. see Ibid., pp. 189-195.

100. Ibid., 4:301.

101. "'Porro Unum Est Necessarium,'" Prose Works 8:366.

102. "Schools in the Reign of Queen Victoria," Prose Works 11:245.

103. Schools and Universities on the Continent, Prose Works 4:301-302.

104. "Literature and Science," Prose Works 10:61.

105. Schools and Universities on the Continent, Prose Works 4:221. See Ibid., p. 117 for French schools.

106. Ibid., p. 252. Ten years later, however, he could say that the quality of modern language instruction in French public schools was now "much on a par with our instruction." ("'Porro Unum Est Necessarium,'" Prose Works 8:355).

107. Schools and Universities on the Continent, Prose Works 4:300.

108. See, for example, Ibid., pp. 115-116, p. 190, p. 299; "'Porro Unum Est Necessarium,'" Prose Works 8:355.

109. Letter to John Conington, May 17, 1865, Russell, Letters 1:264.

110. "A Guide to English Literature," Prose Works 8:238.

111. "A Liverpool Address," Prose Works 10:76.

112. Reports on Elementary Schools, ed. Sandford, p. 222.

113. Preface (1868) to Schools and Universities on the Continent, Prose Works 4:29.

114. Special Report (1886), Prose Works 11:31. See also "Common Schools Abroad," Prose Works 11:102.

115. Schools and Universities on the Continent, Prose Works 4:267.

116. Preface (1868) to Ibid., p. 15. See also Special Report (1886), Prose Works 11:14.

117. Ibid., p. 31; also pp. 39-40. See "'Ecce, Convertimur ad Gentes,'" Prose Works 9:14.

118. "German Letters on English Education," Prose Works 8:210.

119. Schools and Universities on the Continent, Prose Works 4:175.

120. Special Report (1886), Prose Works 11:31. See also "Common Schools Abroad," Prose Works 11:103-104.

121. Ibid., p. 104.

122. Special Report (1886), Prose Works 11:53.

123. "'Ecce, Convertimur ad Gentes,'" Prose Works 9:14. See also "'Porro Unum Est Necessarium,'" Prose Works 8:367; letter to his sister Susy, Monday (January) 1879, Russell, Letters 2:151.

124. "My Countrymen," Prose Works 5:23.

125. "An Unregarded Irish Grievance," Prose Works 9:303.

126. "Schools in the Reign of Queen Victoria," Prose Works 11:238-239.

127. "An Eton Boy," Prose Works 10:26.

128. A French Eton, Prose Works 2:312.

129. Ibid., p. 312. See also Culture and Anarchy, 1869 Edition, Prose Works 5:530-531 (textual notes); Schools and Universities on the Continent, Prose Works 4:136-137.

130. Friendship's Garland, Prose Works 5:52,70.

131. The Popular Education of France, Prose Works 2:87. See also "'Porro Unum Est Necessarium,'" Prose Works 8:349.

132. "An Eton Boy," Prose Works 10:26.

133. The Popular Education of France, Prose Works 2:53-54. See also Introd. to Ibid., p. 22; also "An Unregarded Irish Grievance," Prose Works 9:304.

134. A French Eton, Prose Works 2:294-295.

135. Ibid., p. 296.

136. "An Eton Boy," Prose Works 10:44.

137. In a letter to Harriet Martineau of July 7, 1864 Arnold contrasted the education provided by the Public Schools with that received by the typical member of the middle class in his private school: "The old public schools were for a class to whom the future does not belong. But they had some great merits. In the first place, the best culture (for the young) going, was attainable in them, though so few attained it and the majority were supposed to be shamefully idle. But this [provision?] and attainability of the best culture keeps the standard high and makes only the best culture be believed in as the best; the middle classes, in their schools, have had no such standard, and the consequence is they believe in [indecipherable]! their man,

for instance, is Dr. Cumming or Spurgeon, while the man of the public school people is Newman. Do you see what I mean here, as to culture? Then as to tone, a high and liberal spirit, and so on." [Letter to Harriet Martineau, July 7, 1864, The A.K. Davis-Matthew Arnold Collection, Univ. of Virginia Library, No. 4885, Box 15 (with the help of Ms. Kirsch's transcript)].

138. A French Eton, Prose Works 2:264.

139. "A Liverpool Address," Prose Works 10:77.

140. Ibid., p. 78.

141. "Dulwich College," a public lecture delivered on prize-giving day at Dulwich College as reported in The Times, July 30, 1885, p. 8, col. 2, Prose Works 10:257.

142. Ibid., p. 256.

143. Schools and Universities on the Continent, Prose Works 4:318. Though there was intimate connection between higher and secondary education in England, there was none at all between higher and popular education. However, "In Germany, France, and Switzerland the case is otherwise." ("Common Schools Abroad," Prose Works 11:102. See also Schools and Universities on the Continent, Prose Works 4:254-255).

144. Ibid., p. 254.

145. Ibid., pp. 312-313.

146. Ibid., pp. 207, 215, 285.

147. Ibid., pp. 134-135.

148. Ibid., p. 327.

149. Ibid., pp. 327, 131, 133.

150. "Education and Competition," Letter to the Editor of the Pall Mall Gazette, October 5, 1870, Prose Works 6:413-414.

151. Schools and Universities on the Continent, Prose Works 4:136-137.

152. Ibid., p. 137.

153. Ibid., p. 321.

154. Ibid., p. 322.

155. Ibid., pp. 128-131.

156. Ibid., p. 255.

157. Ibid., pp. 164, 177.

158. Ibid., pp. 322-323.

159. "A Liverpool Address," Prose Works 10:79.

160. Schools and Universities on the Continent, Prose Works 4:323.

161. "A Liverpool Address," Prose Works 10:80.

162. Schools and Universities on the Continent, Prose Works 4:323-324.

163. "On Translating Homer," Prose Works 1:139; "A Liverpool Address," Prose Works 10:80.

164. Schools and Universities on the Continent, Prose Works 4:323.

165. Ibid., pp. 324-325.

166. Ibid., p. 264.

167. Ibid., p. 325.

168. Ibid., p. 326; also p. 256. See also Preface to Second Edition of Higher Schools and Universities in Germany, Prose Works 7:98; also "Irish Catholics and British Liberalism," Prose Works 8:336-337.

169. A French Eton, Prose Works 2:287.

170. "The Irish University Question," Prose Works 9:57.

171. Schools and Universities on the Continent, Prose Works 4:165-166.

172. Ibid., p. 326.

173. "A Liverpool Address," Prose Works 10:79-80.

174. The Bristol Times and Mirror, Friday, March 9, 1888, p. 8, col. 4, Prose Works 11:382.

175. "A Liverpool Address," Prose Works 10:88.

Chapter Seven

Conclusion

A) Summary

It has been the fundamental argument in the preceding chapters that Matthew Arnold was strongly influenced by what he had witnessed on the Continent during his official tours for the Newcastle and Taunton Commissions, in 1859 and 1865 respectively, and for the Education Department in 1885-1886, and also during his numerous unofficial trips abroad. This influence was also greatly reinforced by his extensive readings in foreign literature, culture, history, religion, politics. More specifically, it has been contended that his diverse foreign experiences played a most decisive role in the formation of many of his views on the state of English society, particularly on the civilisation of the middle classes, and of his views on the steps which should be taken in order to transform this society into a modern State. The arguments of the thesis have been developed about the central theme of Arnold as comparative educator, a title which had very often been assigned to him but which up to this present work had not been elaborated into a full-length discussion.

Education played a most significant part in Arnold's life, since for thirty-five years, from 1851 until his retirement in 1886, he earned his living, travelling throughout England and Wales, first as one of Her Majesty's twenty School Inspectors of Elementary Schools, then from 1870 as a Senior Inspector, and from 1884 as Chief Inspector. It is natural that he became in the process exceedingly well acquainted with a multitude of schools, with thousands of pupils, with a great variety of teachers, as well as with the diverse bodies which controlled the schools. Accordingly, it is a fact, and one not always associated with Arnold, that he knew more about his nation's schools than the vast majority of his compatriots. He was also considered most suitable to report on foreign educational systems and practices as his being sent abroad as an Assistant Commissioner for both the Newcastle and Taunton Commissions and as an emissary for the Education Department in the mid-1880s testify. Thus the British Government itself officially placed him in the role of comparative educator and manifestly came to regard him as an expert in this sphere of activity. Indeed, it was in this capacity as an authority on foreign education that he was summoned to give evidence for two whole days in 1886 before the Cross Commission.

Arnold's views on comparative studies in general have been discussed, especially his conviction that the comparative study of foreign societies was very important in inculcating that essential understanding that one's own society was not necessarily the best in every respect, but that other societies often had much of value to offer. For example, more self-critical comparison by the English would help break down what he felt to be their insular, narrow, and often arrogant attitudes and, at the same time, would foster among them a greater cosmopolitan feeling, a more European consciousness, and an appreciation for the numerous merits of foreign societies. But with respect to the more restricted focus of comparative education it has been concluded that Arnold was in the mainstream of comparative educators in that he viewed the field's main function to be ameliorative, that is one studied foreign educational systems in order to learn lessons which would help in transforming the domestic system. In the history of comparative education Matthew Arnold is firmly placed in the stage of educational borrowing. However, he also considered that a comparative educator should be concerned with much more than the mere adoption of foreign educational practices for the purpose of improving his own country's educational structure. It was just as important for the comparative educator to ascertain, if indeed foreign educational practices were judged superior to domestic ones, what results proceeded from this superiority. How precisely did people benefit from this superiority?

It has been a major aspect of the thesis to argue that certain Continental peoples, the French and Germans in particular, were considered by Arnold to be making far more progress than his own compatriots. But in making this claim he consistently stressed that theirs was not the obvious material progress that England, the great industrial and imperial power, was making for much of his life. Rather, French and German progress manifested itself in their possession of those qualities which Arnold variously termed intelligence, sweetness, light, GEIST, and culture, which he believed his own countrymen so grievously lacked. Moreover, these were qualities which he regarded as being especially necessary in the very swiftly changing modern age; in fact, true modernity implied their possession. But it was Arnold's fervent belief that the English middle classes, increasingly the rulers of England and the ones who thought that they were blazing the path of progress and showing the world what modernity signified, were especially in need of these qualities, this "intellectual deliverance." It was above all others these people with their Philistinism, their Hebraism, their Nonconformity, their participation in the religion of inequality, their association with the Liberal Party, and the rest of their sorry civilisation, who had to be thoroughly transformed by the influx of lucidity and culture. This was the dominant lesson derived by Arnold from his comparative studies.

If the major lesson learned by Arnold from all his comparative educational experiences was the failure of England's middle classes to respond to the spirit of the modern age and their general inadequacy in the intellectual sphere vis-à-vis their counterparts on the Continent, another important lesson was the means to be employed in effecting an "intellectual deliverance" among them and thereby achieving their transformation. This means was the establishment of a public educational system modelled on certain Continental systems. For Arnold considered that the French and German state-controlled secondary schools and universities (and those of Italy and Switzerland, to a lesser extent) were major agencies in inculcating among many members of their respective middle classes the intelligence, culture, and science which he fervently desired should also be fostered among the English middle classes. It is true that he came over the years to be increasingly disillusioned by the French lack of seriousness and "conduct" or morality and that he felt that their State-intervention in education, as in other spheres, tended at times to be excessive. Still, as has been stressed, he rarely had anything but high praise for most aspects of France's public school and university system. In like manner, for all his disapproval of certain elements of German civilisation, he invariably lauded the Prussian and other German State educational systems as even more potent than those of the French in cultivating their pupils' intellects.

But Arnold was not nearly so sanguine about the ability of the secondary schools and third level educational institutions in England to imbue their pupils with the requisite culture and lucidity, believing that his nation's middle classes were "nearly the worst educated in the world." A number of the defects which he thought blatant in these institutions, with which the English themselves were well satisfied, have been discussed. For example, with respect to secondary schools he consistently criticised their inadequate number, their lack of proper control and securities, the often deficient quality of teachers, the neglect of "science," the absence of standardised curricula and texts, and the tendency to perpetuate separation and even discord among the different classes. In like manner, he considered that the existing state of England's third level institutions was inadequate. The universities were too few, were, generally, socially inegalitarian, and catered to only a tiny segment of the population. Moreover, they failed to fulfil what he regarded as the proper function of a university, namely the development of "science" in their students. In addition, England was sorely deficient in those special schools which were so numerous on the Continent and which he believed were so essential in the modern age. But the one predominant reason, adduced over and over again in his writings, why England's educational institutions were inferior to many abroad lay in the quite different roles of the State in the respective countries. The foreign institutions were State controlled and there was a conscious, deliberate plan by the authorities to produce a really cultured and intelligent middle class. In England, however, post-elementary institutions, mainly autonomous and under no State control, were generally free to teach what they liked and how they liked and if his notions of culture and science happened to result it was more likely, he believed, to be by chance than by design. Accordingly, it is hardly surprising that his comparative educational studies led him inexorably to the conclusion that State intervention was wellnigh essential in education if his ideal of a transformed and cultured middle class was to result.

As increased State action was viewed by Arnold as being so vital for transforming the middle classes and leading England to true modernity, a detailed discussion has been provided of what exactly he understood by the State. As he himself admitted, disingenuously perhaps, his forte did not lie in speculative philosophy and though he did in a number of writings attempt a philosophical analysis of the State it has been argued that it was by no means a full and a consistently coherent treatment. His definition of the State as "the nation in its collective and corporate character," as the "organ of our collective best self, of our national right reason," as an entity above all individuals and all social classes but embracing the collective will of the entire community, something on the lines of Rousseau's VOLONTÉ GÉNÉRALE, was left as lofty theory with little indication how it should be embodied in concrete situations. Similarly, his doctrine of the "aliens" or the "remnant" is problematic in that he never really defined these notions, never showed exactly how they were to be composed, nor demonstrated what precise connection they bore to the State. It has been contended that there is a distinct ambiguity in his handling of the State. On the one hand, in a small number of writings he proffered a philosophical treatment of the State, in a wholly un-English, distinctly Continental fashion, declaring that it was something quite separate from the Parliament or the Government bureaucracy. On the other hand, in many more writings, he treated the State in much more everyday terms, viewing it as an entity with such usual political apparatus as Ministers, Departments, Boards. But he never seemed to combine into one comprehensible unity his theoretical and his more practical treatments. At any rate, though his theoretical State clearly owed something to Continental writers, it has been argued that it was above all what he had himself witnessed of practical State activity on the Continent which was one of the main influences exerted by his comparative educational experiences. His theoretical State, he obviously hoped, would receive its embodiment somehow, someday. But he was sufficiently realistic to insist that it was now urgent that there be more practical, more normal State intervention in society, and particularly State involvement in education at all levels.

In conclusion an examination has been provided of Arnold's prescriptions for establishing in England a public educational system on the Continental model. For example, among the large number of proposals were the following: that there be a Minister of Education and an Educational Council; that a balance exist between the action of central and local government in educational affairs; that the State re-organize England's plenteous endowments for secondary schools; that the State provide funding to supplement school fees; that the State furnish adequate securities of fitness for the secondary schools, especially by means of public examinations; that the State ensure the suitability of teachers' qualifications and experience before granting certification; that the curriculum of the proposed post-elementary public institutions, by the substitution of a much broader range of subjects for the customary heavy emphasis on the philological study of the Classics, reflect the spirit of the modern age; that the State establish a number of Continental style post-secondary special schools; that the State set up eight to ten university level teaching institutions throughout the country whose degrees would be granted by the examining boards of the Universities of Oxford, Cambridge, and London; that the State ensure that there be strong connexion and coordination between the different levels--elementary, secondary, higher--of the new educational system. In other words, Arnold wanted a State controlled, total reorganization of England's post-elementary educational structure. The resulting public system would be a major agency for transforming the middle classes and thereby uplifting the whole tone of English society.

B) Some Final Thoughts

i) Arnold was "'en fin de compte' English of the English."

Now, it is sometimes asserted that Arnold was so depreciatory of English society and so enamoured of things Continental that he wished his compatriots to become as much as possible like other nationalities such as the French and Germans. However, nothing could be further from the truth. Frederic E. Faverty was correct in his observation that of Arnold "it is certainly unjust to say that he is blind to the faults of every country except his own. He does indeed, as T.S. Eliot says, 'build a bridge across the channel,' but he is never under the delusion that Elysium is to be discovered on the other side." [1] Assured he certainly was that all was not well with the English middle classes but he was just as convinced that the Continentals were far from being perfect. These English middle classes had to be changed but he was far from believing that the answer lay in their becoming quasi-Germans or quasi-Frenchmen: "I do not wish them to be the cafe-haunting, dominoes-playing Frenchmen, but rather some third thing, neither the Frenchmen nor their present selves." [2] It would, indeed, be most beneficial if the English middle classes adopted some of the qualities of the French and other foreigners, especially those which would help them in attaining that "intellectual deliverance" so representative of the modern age, but in doing so they were to remain distinctly English. For, as Arnold declared in his 1859 "England and the Italian Question," "an Englishman, with his country's history behind him, descends and deteriorates by becoming anything but an Englishman." [3] Nevertheless, mere pride in one's Englishness was not sufficient unless this Englishness was supported by excellence. As he wrote to his mother on March 10, 1866: "I should be sorry to be a Frenchman, German, or American, or anything but an Englishman; but I know that this native instinct which other nations, too, have does not prove one's superiority, but that one has to achieve this by undeniable excellent performance." [4] Still, remaining an Englishman did not necessarily indicate adding intellectual insularity to the inescapable physical insularity. Arnold was quite adamant that his countrymen could learn much to their advantage from aspects of cross-Channel life.

Certainly, much of Arnold's own "intellectual deliverance" had been fostered by his great knowledge of foreign culture, so much so that in his own day and subsequently he was sometimes shrugged off with greater or lesser distaste as not having been really English at all and as having somehow "let the side down." Nor are these critics referring to his Celticness. Taking just one example we could mention the famous English critic Sir Walter Raleigh who wrote that Arnold: "had too little affection for England....He stands among them, a well-bred, highly-cultivated stranger, and tries to win them to the light. But there is nothing in what he says, or in what he implies, to indicate that he would have felt any disappointment, any sense even of partial loss, if they had all become French philosophers or wandering Jews." [5] But this is to miss the man. For Arnold was imbued with a thorough love of and pride in things English.[6] In fact, it was his great regard for his own countrymen and his desire to help them in what he felt to be their present crisis that he turned to the Continent for guidance. As Douglas Bush put it, "If Arnold had not greatly loved his country and the mass of his countrymen, he would not have laboured so zealously to chasten and improve them." [7] He saw his work as a comparative educator not merely as pinpointing faults in English education and civilisation but, more important, as making proposals how borrowing judiciously from abroad would help in the reformation of the domestic situation. It was his love of his compatriots and his eagerness to improve them which were his dominant motives as a comparative educator. Accordingly, it is clear that his possession of a broad ranging interest in the manifold affairs of foreign nations and his willingness to learn from them did not render him one whit less English. Henry James in a 1884 article captured this aspect of Arnold very deftly:

> what is so agreeable in his composition is that he is EN FIN DE COMPTE (as the foreigner might say) English of the English. Few writers have given such proof of this; few writers have had such opportunity to do so; for few writers have English affairs, the English character, the future, the development, the happiness, of England, been matters of such constant and explicit concern. It is not in the United States that Mr. Arnold will have struck people as not being a devoted child of the mother country. He has assimilated certain continental ways of looking at things, his style has a kind of European accent, but he is full of English piety and English good-humour (in addition to an urbanity still more personal), and his spirit, in a word, is anchored in the deeps of the English past. [8]

It was the possession of this "kind of European accent" which Arnold felt would also be of benefit to the middle classes in their transformation from their blinkered, narrow, provincial world-view to a broader, more embracing, tolerant, and cultured outlook. Intellectual insularity may have been pardoned when England really did lead the world but that day was now past; other countries and other peoples had much to offer in a diversity of spheres and much was to be gained from comparative study. It was now time for the middle classes and the rest of the English to learn from the best European practice and to persuade them of this, Arnold devoted much of his life.

ii) The "Culture" which was to result from a Public Educational System

Though it has earlier been pointed out that Arnold in his comparative educational and many other writings stressed the increasing urgency for the English middle classes to attain culture, GEIST, lucidity, if ever they were to achieve progress in the modern world, no lengthy or detailed discussion has been provided of what he precisely meant by such qualities. To do so would perhaps have required another thesis and, moreover, much has already been written on this topic. But it must be stressed again that the progress which he earnestly desired for this class had little to do with the "triumphs of material progress" [9] clearly pervasive throughout England, but, on the other hand, that it connoted that immaterial "intellectual deliverance" which he found much more prevalent among the middle classes of France and Germany. The English middle classes, he felt, were good at the material pursuits of money-making and industry, and they presumed that their seriousness would compensate for the inadequacies of mere materialism. But much more was needed, he was convinced, for these stimuli were "not by themselves sufficient. The need in man for intellect and knowledge, his desire for beauty, his instinct for society, and for pleasurable and graceful forms of society, require to have their stimulus felt also, felt and satisfied."[10] As has been seen, he believed that the morality or "conduct" which the middle classes had in plenty amounted to "three-fourths of human life," and was, accordingly, essential.[11] But conduct had to be complemented by the remaining one-fourth of human life; Hebraism had to be balanced by Hellenism, for "conduct is impaired by the want of science and culture."[12] Indeed, his beloved

Greece, famed for art, science, and culture perished "for want of conduct, steadiness, character."[13] As he declared in 1887 in "The Nadir of Liberalism,"

> Therefore at the present time that need for us, on which I have so often and so vainly insisted, to let our minds have free and fair play, no longer to deceive ourselves, to brush aside the claptrap and fictions of our public and party life, to be lucid, to get at the plain simple truth, to see things as they really are, becomes more urgent, more the one thing needful for us, than ever. [14]

Furthermore, this was especially important, as "intelligence," he considered, was the conspicuous want among the English:

> The profession of faith...that knowledge is power, that there is an intelligible law of things, that the human mind seeks to arrive at it, and that our welfare depends on our arriving at it and obeying it, this profession of faith, I say, is sound in itself, it is precious, and we do well to insist upon it. It puts in due prominence a quality which does not always get enough regard in this country,--intelligence. [15]

Sometimes Arnold spoke of the increasing role of "science" in the modern world: "The bent of our time is towards science, towards knowing things as they are."[16] But he was convinced that science was by no means the most obvious quality of the English and, of course, they had no State schools to help them develop it. In fact, he was apprehensive lest his lectures published as On the Study of Celtic Literature in 1867 would be too scientific for his readers: "the dose of science which the general reader in this country can stand being so very small."[17] However, this was a quality which he considered to be evident among the French and Germans and to be especially inculcated by their respective school systems. Moreover, these nationalities were by no means alone in displaying a tendency for science, for the Italians also, as he wrote in a letter from Florence in 1865 while he was engaged in his comparative educational work for the Taunton Commission, were characterised by their scientific intellect: "Through all Europe the movement is now towards science, and the Italian people is distinguished amongst all others by its scientific intellect--this is undoubtedly true; so that with the movement there is now among them there is no saying where they may go."[18] As pointed out, though Arnold considered that there were numerous problems in the Italian secondary educational system he welcomed the increasing State involvement at this level, an involvement which he clearly believed was aiding the development of their scientific intellect, just as the analogous public systems were fostering science in France and Germany.

But it was the educational system of Prussia and the rest of Germany, even more than that of France, which Arnold believed was especially effective in inculcating science. It has been mentioned earlier that he had looked with favour on the work of Wilhelm Von Humboldt, Prussia's Minister of Education from 1809-1810, and he would undoubtedly have subscribed to Von Humboldt's belief that "'the concern in teaching is not with the practical requirements of life but purely with the pupil himself, with knowledge for its own sake, with the cultivation of the feelings and in the longer term with the study of academic disciplines.'"[19] Moreover, it seems as if Arnold was especially influenced by the notions of BILDUNG and WISSENSCHAFT which Von Humboldt fervently wished to be inculcated in the German youth. BILDUNG, which has been defined as "a concept which combined the meaning carried by the English word EDUCATION with notions of character formation and moral cultivation," and WISSENSCHAFT, which Arnold himself called "science, knowledge systematically pursued and prized in and for itself," were clearly important aspects of Arnold's "culture" and "science."[20] Prussia had viewed the development of this type of education in its youth, especially those of the bourgeoisie, as being one of the leading ways of restoring the nation's stature and prestige after the terrible defeat and humiliation suffered at Jena in 1806 at the hands of Napoleon. In like manner, Arnold considered that the English middle class, transformed by the inculcation of a similar educational ideal, would be a most effective means for lifting his nation from what he held to be a slough relative to other European countries, especially as it was now this class who were the real rulers of England.

Though all these qualities--science, culture, Hellenism, lucidity, GEIST--were not exact synonyms, they undoubtedly were closely related in Arnold's eyes. He considered them all as aspects of the state of being really educated and civilised and being truly in touch with the spirit of the modern age. Furthermore, his comparative studies of foreign societies impressed upon him strongly that it was their greater presence among certain Continental peoples which were aiding these peoples to attain true progress in the modern world and in the process to leave the English lagging behind. Consequently, as we read in a January 1865 letter to his sister K (Jane Martha), he was convinced that it was now more and more vital that his compatriots become imbued with these qualities and take their rightful place on the world stage:

> Indeed, I am convinced that as SCIENCE, in the
> widest sense of the word, meaning a true knowledge

> of things as the basis of our operations, becomes, as it does become, more of a power in the world, the weight of the nations and men who have carried the intellectual life farthest will more and more be felt; indeed, I see signs of this already. That England may run well in this race is my deepest desire; and to stimulate her and to make her feel how many clogs she wears, and how much she has to do in order to run in it as her genius gives her the power to run, is the object of all I do. [21]

Moreover, the inculcation of such qualities would be a major step towards ridding the English middle classes of their Philistinism and thereby bringing about their transformation. As he observed in On the Study of Celtic Literature (1867):

> At this moment, when the narrow Philistinism, which has long had things its own way in England, is showing its natural fruits, and we are beginning to feel ashamed, and uneasy, and alarmed at it; now, when we are becoming aware that we have sacrificed to Philistinism culture, and insight, and dignity, and acceptance, and weight among the nations, and hold on events that deeply concern us, and control of the future, and yet that it cannot even give us the fool's paradise it promised us, but is apt to break down, and to leave us with Mr. Roebuck's and Mr. Lowe's laudations of our matchless happiness, and the largest circulation in the world assured to the Daily Telegraph, for our only comfort; at such a moment it needs some moderation not to be attacking Philistinism by storm, but to mine it through such gradual means as the slow approaches of culture....But the hard unintelligence, which is just now our bane, cannot be conquered by storm; it must be suppled and reduced by culture, by a growth in the variety, fulness, and sweetness of our spiritual life; and this end can only be reached by studying things that are outside of ourselves, and by studying them disinterestedly. Let us reunite ourselves with our better mind and with the world through science.[22]

iii) Was Arnold a Reliable Critic?

It would, indeed, take another lengthy work to describe satisfactorily the precise changes which Arnold wished that this "intellectual deliverance" should effect in the general intellectual and cultural state of his middle class compatriots. But so also would there be required much research and discussion to arrive at any adequate evaluation of his opinions regarding this class's poor civilisation as contrasted with that of middle classes abroad. In fact, this would involve a lengthy comparative analysis of English and Continental social and intellectual history during much of the Victorian period. However, the main concern in this work has been with Arnold's own opinions of these matters and his views have been presented with little critical assessment of just what validity they could be said to have. Furthermore, it is notoriously difficult to determine the validity of opinions which are for the most part value judgements. It is not easy to draw up criteria establishing the factual basis of such views as the inadequacy of Nonconformist religions, the Hebraism of the middle class, their Philistinism, the lucidity of the French, the science of the Germans, the failure of England to meet the needs of the modern age as well as other Continental nations. These were all topics on which Arnold wrote profusely and usually with fervent conviction and assurance, though on at least one occasion, in his 1877 "A Guide to English Literature," he acknowledged that "No man can trust himself to speak of his own time and his own contemporaries with the same sureness of judgement and the same proportion as of times and men gone by."[23] However, it is beyond the scope of this thesis to ascertain which of Arnold's judgements were more valid than others. But, taking just one example, if Arnold was right in holding that lucidity and science were more prevalent among the French and Germans than among the English, perhaps there were significant reasons other than their

State-controlled educational systems which accounted for these qualities. He, of course, admitted that schools were not everything, but a case could be made that he still placed excessive faith in them. Generally, we should be careful about accepting implicitly his views of English and foreign societies. He certainly had a wider knowledge and experience both about his own country and certain Continental ones than most of his contemporaries, but there were, of course, numerous other contrary opinions about such topics as have been discussed in the preceding chapters. At any rate, when we read Arnold it is wise to remember that his criticism of English society was often the voice of the prosecutor only; his words did not present the views of the defence.[24] It could, indeed, be argued, for instance, that the "intelligence" of the middle classes was not as bad as he pictured, that he was sometimes less than fair in his treatment of their civilisation.

Be that as it may, it seems that in one very important respect Arnold's criticism of the middle classes would be supported by a majority of scholars today, namely his censure of their schools. For most would agree that if they were not all of the Salem House model, there was still room for copious improvement. Nor was he alone among his contemporaries in casting aspersions on middle class education. As has been pointed out, the 1868 General Report of the Taunton Commission which had provided a most thorough and minute analysis of England's secondary schools painted a most dismal picture. The Commission had ranged very widely all over England and Wales and had investigated a vast number of schools. Again and again the Commissioners' assessments of endowed and purely private schools were damning. They were kinder in their views of a number of proprietary schools but they examined only a small number of these. Of the overall situation they could state:

> It is plain from the evidence of our witnesses, and the still more important evidence of our assistant commissioners, that the schools, whether public [i.e. endowed and proprietary schools] or private, which are thoroughly satisfactory are few in proportion to the need. Of these few there are some public and some private; but the private schools are those intended for the upper class and upper half of the middle class. Below that line there is little good education till we come to the elementary schools under Government inspection. [25]

Similarly, Arnold's praise of the French public educational system and particularly his belief in its civilising effect on the intellect of the middle classes were echoed by his colleagues on the Taunton Commission. We read in the General Report: "The French system, as judged from an English point of view, appears to have the merit of being a perfect piece of machinery for the cultivation of the intellect."[26] In like manner, the Commission obviously accepted Arnold's analogous praises of the State educational system in Prussia:

> When we view it as a whole, the Prussian system appears to be at once the most complete and the most perfectly adapted to its people, of all that now exist. It is not wanting in the highest cultivation like the American, nor in dealing with the mass of the middle classes like our own; nor does it run any risk of sacrificing everything to intellectual proficiency like the French. It is somewhat more bureaucratic in its form than would work well in England, but it is emphatically not a mere centralized system in which the Government is everything. In France the central government is undeniably distinct from the people; supported by the people no doubt, and obeyed by them, but distinct from them. But in Prussia the education department is simply the instrument which the people use to procure the fulfilment of their own desires. The Prussians believe in culture, and, whoever may have originally created the educational

> machinery, that machinery has now been appropriated by the people themselves....The result is an unrivalled body of teachers, schools meeting every possible need of every class, and a highly cultivated people. [27]

So Arnold was not by any means alone in rebuking the state of middle class education in England and in lauding Continental public educational systems. Accordingly, if sometimes we feel that we cannot accept all of his strictures on English middle class society and his praises of certain aspects of foreign civilisation we should be more confident in believing his judgements of the schools.

iv) Arnold's Influence on the Development of England's Post-Elementary Educational System

If we wish to ascertain just how influential were Arnold's comparative educational works and writings on the development of England's post-elementary education, especially the secondary level, we are still on uncertain ground. He was certainly a prolific critic of English middle class schools vis-à-vis many of their Continental counterparts. Likewise, he was tireless in his asseverations that this class's inadequate schooling was very largely responsible for its unsatisfactory civilisation, whereas the State controlled foreign schools were playing a major role in imbuing their pupils with culture and science and helping them attain that "intellectual deliverance" which he felt was urgently needed to meet the needs of the modern Zeitgeist. He was also insistent in his demands that it was now time to look to these Continental schools and emulate at home some of their characteristics, especially the fact that they were State run. Moreover, there is no doubt but that his views were known. For even if his official reports were not widely read even when published in private editions, his opinions of English and Continental education were contained in a great many of his other diverse writings which were generally first published in journals and magazines with a large readership. Indeed, he was one of the major intellectual and literary figures of the day whose opinions as expressed in such publications as _Pall Mall Gazette_, _Fortnightly Review_, _Quarterly Review_, _Macmillan's Magazine_, _Fraser's Magazine_ and many others were eagerly read by great numbers of England's educated. More specifically, it is manifest that his criticisms of his country's educational provision and his prescriptions for improving it by adopting certain foreign practices were common knowledge to all those who were involved in the management of education. He was without any doubt the best known and most distinguished Inspector of Schools, even if not, as some contemporaries observed, with respect to the actual mundane inspectorial duties affecting elementary schools, any better than his fellow Inspectors. He was also the most vocal Inspector and the one who provided the greatest embarrassment and trouble to those who held the top positions in the Education Department, especially through his repeated vociferous censure of the Revised Code during the 1860s. Moreover, his abilities were obviously recognized as his three official trips abroad and his invitation to present evidence to the Cross Commission in 1886 testify. At any rate, we can say quite categorically that even if his views were not always liked by all his superiors they were at least widely known. Nevertheless, even with all the above factors taken into consideration, can we say for certain that his comparative educational opinions had a major practical effect on the course of English education? If Arnold had never visited foreign schools would the history of his nation's education have been significantly different? As is the case with many such hypothetical questions a satisfactory answer is extremely difficult to provide. Furthermore, this is particularly so with respect to Arnold's influence on secondary education. It would perhaps be easier to assess his influence on the changes made at the elementary level for it was with this level that he was officially and most intimately connected during his thirty-five years as an H.M.I. However, there were more fundamental changes happening to elementary education during Arnold's life than to secondary; state involvement, for instance, which made its first hesitant beginnings in 1833, within a space of thirty-seven years grew into the complex system prescribed by the 1870 Education Act. But secondary education which certainly did not remain static in his day still did not undergo so many changes, with the State, for example, waiting until the early twentieth century before drawing this level into a public system. In addition, Arnold's official work in the sphere of secondary education was confined to his comparative educational duties for the Taunton Commission, though, as we have seen, his unofficial views were scattered throughout his very prolific writings. So if we consider that his official work for middle class education was small and, moreover, that education at this level did not witness a plethora of drastic changes during his life, it is hard to make a very convincing case that he had a particularly DIRECT influence on the course of secondary education of his own day. However, his INDIRECT influence, though, of course, impossible to quantify, was assuredly significant especially during that decade and a half immediately after his death which witnessed major intervention by the

State in the secondary sphere. His standing as one of the foremost Victorian sages and as a leading educationist would have guaranteed that for this period at least his views persisted in the consciousness of those who wrought the educational changes.

However, if it is a difficult task to ascertain what precise influence Arnold the comparative educator wielded over developments at the higher levels of English education, it can be stated with certitude that, as has often been pointed out, in his role as prophet he was very influential. This is a point well brought out by. R.L. Archer in his 1921 Secondary Education in the Nineteenth Century. Arnold, he declared

> is peculiarly interesting to us because he was both educationist and prophet and because he succeeded in influencing the education of the succeeding generation by his work as a prophet, whereas he failed to influence that of his own generation by his professional work as an educationist. His educational views were the direct outcome of his attitude as a prophet, and they can be read in the present age with approval. But they were in advance of his time and, though what he wrote was highly valued by Royal Commissions and by educational reformers, as far as immediate effect on educational legislation and administration was concerned he was a voice crying in the wilderness.[28]

Nor was Archer alone in his description of Arnold as a prophet. H.C. Dent, for instance, declared that "It was the prophetic insight of Thomas Arnold's son Matthew which first compelled England to think and to talk seriously about 'secondary education.'"[29] B. Pattison, writing in 1952 of Arnold's educational work, observed that he "has proved prophetic in more senses than one. Much of what he foresaw has happened."[30] W.C. Connell acknowledged that Arnold the educationist "in due course and by slow degrees, was to establish his right to the title of Prophet in the more generally accepted sense of the term."[31] Likewise, Peter Butterfield called him "a prophet of the immediate future for most of his recommendations or demands were either instigated or complete within twenty years of his death."[32] Arnold himself had stated at the end of his major comparative educational work, the 1868 Schools and Universities on the Continent: "I have a profound conviction that if this country is destined, as I trust it is destined, still to live and prosper, the next quarter of a century will see a reconstruction of English education as entire as that which I have recommended in these remarks, however impossible such a reconstruction may to many now seem."[33] Well, he was wrong in his prophecy about "the next quarter of a century," but he was not too far out, for many of his recommendations resulting from his comparative educational work for the Taunton Commission were put into practice soon enough after those twenty-five years. In fact, even within this period, in 1888, the year of his death, the passing of the Local Government Act which established County and County Borough Councils throughout the country, was the first step in the creation of a manageable local administration for the sort of educational system desired by Arnold. Moreover, in the following year the Welsh Intermediate Education Act set up in every county and county borough of Wales joint education committees whose task was to develop secondary and technical education. In 1895 the Report of the Bryce Commission on secondary education echoed many of the recommendations earlier made by Arnold though few, if any of the Report's proposals were implemented immediately. Nevertheless, the Report itself was well-received. Then, the rationalisation of the administrative muddle at the central level received an impetus with the Board of Education Act of 1899 which substituted a single Board of Education for the existing Education Department, the Department of Science and Art, and the Charity Commission. This Board was headed by a President (but not the Minister which the 1895 Bryce Commission had recommended) and there was a Consultative Committee to advise it. Though Arnold would not have been satisfied with these developments, he would at least have welcomed them for making England's educational system a little more like his admired German system. At any rate, it is clear that in the 1890s there was now very wide acceptance that the time had come for the State to involve itself to a much greater degree than formerly in secondary education. Accordingly, when Balfour's famous 1902 Education Act was passed, though many of its provisions were highly controversial, the view was widely expressed in the House of Commons and elsewhere that if the Bill had been confined to secondary education there would have been little dispute. Certainly, Arnold would have been pleased with this Act as far as secondary education was concerned, and also for its complete reorganisation of local education administration. This latter saw the forging of "the crucial partnership between central and local government which has since remained fundamental to the English educational system,"[34] and which did much to provide that balance between central and local authorities considered essential by Arnold for any good public system. Though the Act did not set up a truly national educational system of secondary education it did, at any rate, provide the indispensable foundations on which one would later be built. Such a system under a Minister of Education was finally established in 1944 with the passing of Butler's Education Act. Most of

Arnold's prescriptions for a State controlled educational system had now, mutatis mutandis, come to fruition.

Matthew Arnold saw the purpose of comparative education as being one of amelioration. Certainly, the domestic educational system was to be improved by adopting specific features of foreign systems but this was only viewed as a catalyst for fostering more far-ranging improvements throughout the wider society. The actual mechanics of an educational system were very secondary to the results which it engendered. He held that the primary merit of the French and German systems, which he lauded so highly, lay in the fact that they produced boys characterised by GEIST, lucidity, and culture. It was because their State systems were more effective agencies, in his opinion, than the private schools of England for stimulating that "intellectual deliverance" demanded by the modern age which made their study and emulation so crucial. In fine, comparative education for Arnold was concerned just as much with the effects of educational institutions on students and, very important, on society at large as with the actual structure of the institutions themselves. In this he anticipated modern practitioners in the field.

REFERENCES

1. Faverty, Matthew Arnold the Ethnologist, p. 8.

2. "A Courteous Explanation," Friendship's Garland, Prose Works 5:34.

3. "England and the Italian Question," Prose Works 1:73.

4. Letter to his mother, March 10, 1866, Russell, Letters 1:320.

5. Walter Raleigh, "Matthew Arnold," Some Authors (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1923), p. 305.

6. Though Arnold was always happy to indulge his love of foreign travel he was sometimes homesick and glad to return to his beloved England. "I thirst for England," he wrote from Stockbridge, Massachusetts in 1886. (Letter to his sister Fan, August 10, 1886, Russell, Letters 2:343).

7. Douglas Bush, Matthew Arnold, p. 129.

8. Henry James, "Matthew Arnold," English Illustrated Magazine, January 1884, reprinted in Literary Reviews and Essays by Henry James, ed. Albert Mordell (New Haven, Conn.: College and University Press, 1957), p. 341.

9. A French Eton, Prose Works 2:315.

10. "A Liverpool Address," Prose Works 10:83.

11. Literature and Dogma, Prose Works 6:173.

12. Ibid., p. 408.

13. Ibid., p. 388.

14. "The Nadir of Liberalism," Prose Works 11:71.

15. "'Ecce, Convertimur ad Gentes,'" Prose Works 9:5.

16. On the Study of Celtic Literature, Prose Works 3:298.

17. Letter to his mother, February 28, 1866, Russell, Letters 1:319.

18. Letter to his mother, May 24, 1865, Ibid., 1:269.

19. Quoted in Arthur Hearnden, Education in the Two Germanies (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1974), p. 18.

20. James J. Sheehan, German Liberalism in the Nineteenth Century (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1978), p. 14. Schools and Universities on the Continent, Prose Works 4:263.

21. Letter to his sister K (Jane Martha), January 6, 1865, Russell, *Letters* 1:246.

22. *On the Study of Celtic Literature*, *Prose Works* 3:385-386.

23. "A Guide to English Literature," *Prose Works* 8:248.

24. See George Watson, "Arnold and the Victorian Mind," *Review of English Literature* 8, No. 3 (July 1967):passim.

25. *Schools Inquiry Commission*, 1868, *British Parliamentary Papers, Education General* (Shannon, Ireland: Irish University Press, 1970), 17:104.

26. Ibid., 17:61-62.

27. Ibid., 17:72.

28. R.L. Archer, *Secondary Education in the Nineteenth Century* (London: Cass and Co., 1966; 1st ed. 1921), p. 185.

29. H.C. Dent, *Secondary Education for All* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1949), p. 3.

30. B. Pattison, "Matthew Arnold," *Pioneers of English Education*, ed. A.V. Judges (London: Faber and Faber, 1952), p. 206.

31. Connell, *Educational Thought*, p. 281.

32. Butterfield, "Aspects," p. 291.

33. *Schools and Universities on the Continent*, *Prose Works* 4:328.

34. Keith Evans, *The Development and Structure of the English School System* (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1985), p. 79.

SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY

This list includes only those works specifically mentioned in the text. Sources which have proved particularly helpful are marked with an ■ .

I) WORKS OF MATTHEW ARNOLD

A) Prose

i) Collected Works:

The Complete Prose Works of Matthew Arnold. ed. R.H. Super. 11 vols. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 1960-1977 (hereinafter referred to as *Prose Works* with appropriate vol. no.):

England and the Italian Question. *Prose Works* 1:65-96. (1st pub. Aug. 1859)

On Translating Homer. *Prose Works* 1:97-216. (1st pub. Jan. 1861)

■ *The Popular Education of France*. *Prose Works* 2:3-211. (1st pub. May 1861)

"The Twice-Revised Code." *Prose Works* 2:212-243. (1st pub. *Fraser's Magazine*, March 1862).

"Mr. Walter and Schoolmasters' Certificates." *Prose Works* 2:257-261. (1st pub. *London Review*, April 1863)

■ *A French Eton*. *Prose Works* 2:262-325. (1st pub. as three articles in *Macmillan's Magazine*, Sept. 1863, Feb. 1864, May 1864; 1st pub. in book form in June 1864)

"The Bishop and the Philosopher." *Prose Works* 3:40-55. (1st pub. *Macmillan's Magazine*, Jan. 1863)

"Dr. Stanley's Lectures on the Jewish Church." *Prose Works* 3:65-82. (1st pub. *Macmillan's Magazine*, Feb. 1863)

"Eugénie de Guérin." *Prose Works* 3:83-106. (1st pub. *The Cornhill*, June 1863)

■ "Heinrich Heine." *Prose Works* 3:107-132. (1st pub. *The Cornhill*, Aug. 1863)

"Joubert." *Prose Works* 3:183-211. (1st pub. *The National Review*, Jan. 1864)

■ "The Literary Influence of Academies." *Prose Works* 3:232-257. (1st pub. *The Cornhill*, Aug. 1864)

■ "The Function of Criticism at the Present Time." Prose Works 3:258-285. (1st pub. The National Review, Nov. 1864)

"Preface" to Essays in Criticism. Prose Works 3:286-290. (1st pub. Macmillan, 1865)

"Education and the State" [I]. Prose Works 4:1-4. (1st pub. Pall Mall Gazette, Dec. 11, 1865)

"Education and the State" [II]. Prose Works 4:5-7. (1st pub. Pall Mall Gazette, Dec. 22, 1865)

"The Mansion-House Meeting." Prose Works 4:8-12. (1st pub. Pall Mall Gazette, Jan. 17, 1866)

On the Study of Celtic Literature. Prose Works 3:291-395. (1st pub. as articles in The Cornhill, March, April, May, July 1866; 1st pub. in book form in June 1867)

■ "My Countrymen." Prose Works 5:3-31. (1st pub. The Cornhill, Feb. 1866)

■ Friendship's Garland. Prose Works 5:32-77; 311-356. (1st pub. as letters in Pall Mall Gazette, 1866-1870; 1st pub. in book form in 1871)

"Theodore Parker." Prose Works 5:79-84. (1st pub. Pall Mall Gazette, Aug. 24, 1867)

■ Culture and Anarchy. Prose Works 5:85-256. (1st pub. as articles in The Cornhill, July, 1867, Jan., Feb., June, July, Sept. 1868; 1st pub. in book form in Jan. 1869)

■ Schools and Universities on the Continent. Prose Works 4:13-328. (1st pub. March, 1868)

■ "German and English Universities." Prose Works 4:329-334. (1st pub. Pall Mall Gazette, May 5, 1868)

■ "On the Modern Element in Literature." Prose Works 1:18-37. (1st pub. Macmillan's Magazine, Feb. 1869)

St. Paul and Protestantism. Prose Works 6:5-127. (1st pub. as three articles in The Cornhill, Oct. 1869, Nov. 1869, Feb. 1870; 1st pub. in book form in May 1870)

"A First Requisite for Church Reform." Prose Works 6:128-133. (1st pub. Pall Mall Gazette, May 30, 1870)

"Education and Competition." Prose Works 6:412-416. (1st pub. Pall Mall Gazette, Oct. 5, 1870)

"Renan's 'La Réforme intellectuelle et morale de la France.'" Prose Works 7:40-50. (1st pub. The Academy, Feb. 15, 1872)

"Isaiah XL-LXVI. Introduction." *Prose Works* 7:51-72. (1st pub. May 1872)

"A French Elijah." *Prose Works* 7:6-11. (1st pub. *Pall Mall Gazette*, Nov. 24, 1872)

Literature and Dogma. *Prose Works* 6:139-411. (1st pub. Feb. 1873)

"A Speech at Westminster." *Prose Works* 7:79-89. (1st pub. *Macmillan's Magazine*, Feb. 1874)

■ "Preface" to the Second Edition of *Higher Schools and Universities in Germany*. *Prose Works* 7:90-130. (1st pub. March 1874)

"Roman Catholics and the State." *Prose Works* 7:131-137. (1st pub. *Pall Mall Gazette*, April 8, 1874)

God and the Bible. *Prose Works* 7:139-398. (1st pub. as six articles in the *Contemporary Review*, Oct. 1874-Sept. 1875; 1st pub. in book form in Nov. 1875)

"Bishop Butler and the Zeit-Geist." *Prose Works* 8:11-62. (1st pub. as two articles in *Contemporary Review*, Feb., March 1876)

"A Last Word on the Burials Bill." *Prose Works* 8:87-110. (1st pub. *Macmillan's Magazine*, July 1876)

"A French Critic on Milton." *Prose Works* 8:165-187. (1st pub. *Quarterly Review*, Jan. 1877)

"Falkland." *Prose Works* 8:188-207. (1st pub. *Nineteenth Century*, March 1877)

"Preface" to *Last Essays*. *Prose Works* 8:148-162. (1st pub. March 1877)

■ "German Letters on English Education." *Prose Works* 8:208-215. 1st pub. *Pall Mall Gazette*, May 3, 1877)

"George Sand." *Prose Works* 8:216-236. (1st pub. *Fortnightly Review*, June 1877)

"A Guide to English Literature." *Prose Works* 8:237-251 (1st pub. *Nineteenth Century*, Dec. 1877)

■ "Equality." *Prose Works* 8:277-305. (1st pub. *Fortnightly Review*, March 1878)

"Johnson's *Lives of the Poets*." *Prose Works* 306-320. (1st pub. *Macmillan's Magazine*, June 1878)

■ "Irish Catholicism and British Liberalism." *Prose Works* 8:321-347. (1st pub. *Fortnightly Review*, July 1878)

■ "'Porro Unum Est Necessarium.'" *Prose Works* 8:348-369. (1st pub. *Fortnightly Review*, Nov. 1878)

"Preface" to *Mixed Essays*. *Prose Works* 8:370-372. (1st pub. Feb. 1879)

■ "'Ecce, Convertimur ad Gentes.'" *Prose Works* 9:1-19. (1st pub. *Fortnightly Review*, Feb. 1879)

"A Speech at Eton." *Prose Works* 9:20-35. (1st pub. *The Cornhill*, May 1879)

"Wordsworth." *Prose Works* 9:36-55. (1st pub. *Macmillan's Magazine*, July, 1879)

"The Irish University Question." *Prose Works* 9:56-60. (1st pub. *The Times*, July 31, 1879)

"The French Play in London." *Prose Works* 9:64-85. (1st pub. *Nineteenth Century*, Aug. 1879)

"Joseph de Maistre on Russia." *Prose Works* 9:86-111. (1st pub. *Quarterly Review*, Oct. 1879)

"Copyright." *Prose Works* 9:114-135. (1st pub. *Fortnightly Review*. March 1880)

■ "The Future of Liberalism." *Prose Works* 9:136-160. (1st pub. *Nineteenth Century*. July 1880)

"The Study of Poetry." *Prose Works* 9:161-188. [1st pub. as the "Introduction" to T. Humphry Ward, ed., *The English Poets* (London: Macmillan, 1880)]

"Byron." *Prose Works* 9:217-237. (1st pub. *Macmillan's Magazine*, March 1881)

■ "The Incompatibles." *Prose Works* 9:238-285. (1st pub. *Nineteenth Century*, April and June 1881)

"Preface" [to Burke's *Letters, Speeches and Tracts on Irish Affairs*, June 1881]. *Prose Works* 9:286-289

"A Genevese Judge."*Prose Works* 9:290-294. (1st pub. *Pall Mall Gazette*, July 13, 1881)

"An Unregarded Irish Grievance." *Prose Works* 9:295-311. (1st pub. *Fortnightly Review*, Aug. 1881)

"Preface" to Irish Essays. Prose Works 9:312-317. (1st pub. Feb. 1882)

"A Word about America." Prose Works 10:1-23. (1st pub. Nineteenth Century, May 1882)

"An Eton Boy." Prose Works 10:24-45. (1st pub. Fortnightly Review, June 1882)

■ "Literature and Science." Prose Works 10:53-73. (1st pub. Nineteenth Century, August 1882)

■ "A Liverpool Address." Prose Works 10:74-88. (1st pub. Nineteenth Century, Nov. 1882)

"A French Worthy." Prose Works 10:89-93. (1st pub. Pall Mall Gazette, Nov. 8, 1882)

"At the Princess's." Prose Works 10:94-96. (1st pub. Pall Mall Gazette, Dec. 6, 1882)

■ "Numbers; or The Majority and the Remnant." Prose Works 10:143-164. (1st pub. Nineteenth Century, April 1884)

"Emerson." Prose Works 10:165-186. (1st pub. Macmillan's Magazine, May 1884)

"George Sand." Prose Works 10:187-189. (1st pub. Pall Mall Gazette, August 12, 1884)

"A Word More about America." Prose Works 10:194-217. (1st pub. Nineteenth Century, Feb. 1885)

"A Comment on Christmas." Prose Works 10:218-238. (1st pub. Contemporary Review, April 1885)

"Preface" to Discourses in America. Prose Works 10:239-241. (1st pub. June 1885)

Reports of Public Lectures and Brief Notes to the Press (1882-1885). Prose Works 10:242-258.

"The Nadir of Liberalism." Prose Works 11:54-77. (1st pub. Nineteenth Century, May 1886)

"The Political Crisis." Prose Works 11:78-81. (1st pub. The Times, May 22, 1886)

■ Special Report on Certain Points Connected with Elementary Education in Germany, Switzerland, and France. Prose Works 11:1-53. (1st pub. July 1886)

"After the Elections." Prose Works 11:82-87. (1st pub. The Times, Aug. 6, 1886)

■ "Common Schools Abroad." Prose Works 11:88-105. (1st pub. Century Magazine, Oct. 1886)

"Sainte-Beuve." Prose Works 11:106-119. (1st pub. Encyclopaedia Britannica, 9th ed., Nov. 1886)

"The Zenith of Conservatism." Prose Works 11:122-143. (1st pub. Nineteenth Century, Jan. 1887)

"A 'Friend of God.'" Prose Works 11:180-189. (1st pub. Nineteenth Century, April 1887)

"Up to Easter." Prose Works 11:190-209. (1st pub. Nineteenth Century, May 1887)

■ "Schools in the Reign of Queen Victoria." Prose Works 11:210-245. [1st pub. in T.H. Ward, ed., Reign of Queen Victoria, vol. 2, (London: Smith, Elder, 1887)]

"From Easter to August."Prose Works 11:246-264. (1st pub. Nineteenth Century, Sept. 1887)

"Count Leo Tolstoi." Prose Works 11:282-304. (1st pub. Fortnightly Review, Dec. 1887)

"Disestablishment in Wales." Prose Works 11:334-349. (1st pub. National Review, March 1888)

"Civilisation in the United States." Prose Works 11:350-369. (1st pub. Nineteenth Century, April 1888)

Reports of Public Lectures and Brief Notes in the Press (1881-1888). Prose Works 11:370-382.

ii) Other Prose:

Culture and Anarchy. ed. by J. Dover Wilson. Cambridge: Cambridge at the University Press, 1963.

■ Culture and the State: Matthew Arnold and Continental Education. ed. with intro. by Paul Nash. New York: Teachers College Press, Columbia University, 1966.

Matthew Arnold. ed. by J. Gribble. London: Collier-Macmillan, 1967.

Matthew Arnold and the Education of the New Order. ed. with intro. by Peter Smith and Geoffrey Summerfield. Cambridge: Cambridge at the University Press, 1969.

"Matthew Arnold's Diaries: The Unpublished Items." Ph.D. thesis by William Bell Guthrie, University of Virginia, 1959. Ann Arbor, Mich.: University Microfilms.

Matthew Arnold on Education. ed. by Gillian Sutherland. Middlesex: Penguin Education, 1973.

■ *The Note-Books of Matthew Arnold*. ed. by H.F. Lowry, Karl Young, and W.H. Dunn. London: Oxford University Press, 1952.

B) *Poetry*

The Poems of Matthew Arnold. ed. by Kenneth Allott. New York: Barnes and Noble, 1965.

The Poetical Works of Matthew Arnold. ed. by C.B. Tinker and H.F. Lowry. London: Oxford University Press, 1950.

C) *Reports*

■ Arnold's evidence before the Cross Commision is contained in *British Parliamentary Papers, Education General*. vol. 34, pp. 184-225. Shannon, Ireland: Irish University Press, 1970.

■ *Report on the System of Education for the Middle and Upper Classes in France, Italy, Germany, and Switzerland* (Arnold's Report for the Taunton Commission, 1867). *British Parliamentary Papers, Education General*, vol. 21, pp. 449-712. Shannon, Ireland: Irish University Press, 1970.

■ *Report on the Systems of Popular Education in Use in France, Holland, and the French Cantons of Switzerland* (Arnold's Report for the Newcastle Commission, 1861). *British Parliamentary Papers, Education General*. vol. 6, pp. 13-160. Shannon, Ireland: Irish University Press, 1969.

■ *Reports on Elementary Schools, 1852-1882*. ed. by Sir Francis Sandford. London and New York: Macmillan, 1889.

■ *Reports on Elementary Schools, 1852-1882*. ed. by F.S. Marvin. London: Wyman, 1908.

■ *Special Report on Certain Points Connected with Elementary Education in Germany, Switzerland, and France* (Arnold's Report for the Education Dept., 1886). *British Sessional Papers*, House of Commons, vol. 51, pp. 245-272.

D) Letters

■ Charlottesville, Virginia. University of Virginia Library. *A.K. Davis-Matthew Arnold Collection*.

■ *Letters of Matthew Arnold, 1848-1888*, ed. by George W.E. Russell. 2 vols. London: Macmillan, 1895.

The Letters of Matthew Arnold to Arthur Hugh Clough. ed. by H.F. Lowry. London: Oxford University Press, 1932.

Matthew Arnold's Books: Toward a Publishing Diary. ed. by William E. Buckler. Geneva: Libraire E. Droz, 1958.

Matthew Arnold's Letters: A Descriptive Checklist. compiled by Arthur Kyle Davis, Jr. Charlottesville, Virginia: The University Press of Virginia, 1968.

Unpublished Letters of Matthew Arnold. ed. by Arnold Whitridge, New Haven: Yale University Press, 1923.

II) Books

Allott, Kenneth. *Matthew Arnold*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1963.

Archer, R.L. *Secondary Education in the Nineteenth Century*. London: Frank Cass and Co., 1966. (1st pub. 1921).

Bamford, T.W. *The Rise of Public Schools*. London: Thomas Nelson and Sons, 1967.

Barker, Sir Ernest. *Political Thought in England 1848 to 1914*. 2nd ed. London: Oxford University Press, 1963.

Barnard, H.C. *A History of English Education From 1760*. 2nd ed. London: University of London Press, 1961.

Bereday, George Z.F. *Comparative Method in Education*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1964.

Brantlinger, Patrick. *The Spirit of Reform: British Literature and Politics, 1832-1867*. Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1977.

Brewer, W.V. *Victor Cousin as a Comparative Educator*. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1971.

Bush, Douglas. *Matthew Arnold: A Survey of his Poetry and Prose*. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1971.

Campos, Christophe, The View of France: From Arnold to Bloomsbury. London: Oxford University Press, 1965.

■ Connell, William F. The Educational Thought and Influence of Matthew Arnold. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1950.

Coulling, Sidney M.B. Matthew Arnold and his Critics: A Study in Arnold's Controversies. Athens, Ohio: Ohio University Press, 1974.

Curtis, S.J., and Boultwood, M.E.A. A Short History of Educational Ideas. 5th ed. London: University Tutorial Press, 1977.

Dawson, Carl, and Pfordresher, John, eds. Matthew Arnold, Prose Writings: The Critical Heritage. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1979.

Dent, H.C. Secondary Education for All. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1949.

Evans, Keith. The Development and Structure of the English School System. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1985.

Faverty, Frederic E. Matthew Arnold the Ethnologist. Chicago: Northwestern University Press, 1951.

Fitch, Sir Joshua. Thomas and Matthew Arnold and Their Influence on English Education. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1897.

Fraser, Stewart E. Jullien's Plan for Comparative Education 1816-1817. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University. 1964.

Gross, John. The Rise and Fall of the Man of Letters. London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1969.

Hans, Nicholas. Comparative Education: A Study of Educational Factors and Traditions. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1980. (1st pub. 1949).

Harding, F.J.W. Matthew Arnold: The Critic and France. Geneva: Libraire Droz, 1964.

Harvey, Charles H. Matthew Arnold: Critic of the Victorian Period. London: James Clarke and Co., 1931.

Hearnden, Arthur. Education in the Two Germanies. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1974.

■ Honan, Park. Matthew Arnold: A Life. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1981; paperback ed., Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1983.

Jump, J.D. Matthew Arnold. London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1955.

Kazamias A.M., and Massialas B.G. Tradition and Change in Education. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1965.

Kelso, Alexander P. Matthew Arnold on Continental Life and Literature. Oxford: Blackwell, 1914.

King, Edmund J. Comparative Studies in Educational Decision. London: Methuen, 1968.

Knickerbocker, F.W. Free Minds: John Morley and his Friends. Conn., U.S.A.: Greenwood Press, 1970. (1st pub. 1943).

■ Knights, Ben. The Idea of the Clerisy in the Nineteenth Century. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1978.

LeRoy, Gaylord C. Perplexed Prophets: Six Nineteenth-Century British Authors. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press for Temple University Publications, 1953.

Lippincott, Benjamin Evans. Victorian Critics of Democracy. Minneapolis: The University of Minnesota Press. 1938.

Mallinson, Vernon. An Introduction to the Study of Comparative Education. 4th ed. London: Heinemann, 1975.

Meiklejohn, Alexander. Education Between Two Worlds. New York: Books for Libraries Press, 1972. (1st pub. 1942).

■ McCarthy, Patrick. Matthew Arnold and the Three Classes. New York and London: Columbia University Press, 1964.

Noah, H.J., and Eckstein, M.A. Toward a Science of Comparative Education. New York: Macmillan, 1969.

Palmer, Imelda. Matthew Arnold: Culture, Society and Education. Melbourne: Macmillan, 1979.

Paul, Herbert W. Matthew Arnold. London: Macmillan and Co., 1907. (1st pub. 1902).

Routh, H.V. Towards the Twentieth Century: Essays in the Spiritual History of the Nineteenth Century. London: Cambridge University Press, 1937.

Russell, George W.E. Matthew Arnold. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1904.

Saintsbury, George. Matthew Arnold. New York: Dodd, Mead and Co., 1899.

■ Schools Inquiry Commission (Taunton Commission, 1868). British Parliamentary Papers, Education General. vol. 17. Shannon, Ireland: Irish University Press, 1970.

Sheehan, James J. German Liberalism in the Nineteenth Century. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1978.

Sherman, Stuart P. Matthew Arnold: How to Know Him. Indianapolis: The Bobbs-Merrill Co., 1917.

Spencer, Herbert. The Study of Sociology. Mich.: Ann Arbor Paperbacks,The University of Michigan Press, 1961. (1st pub. 1973).

Thorpe, Michael. Matthew Arnold. London: Evans Brothers, 1969.

■ Trilling, Lionel. Matthew Arnold. New York: Norton, 1939.

■ Walcott, Fred G. The Origins of Culture and Anarchy: Matthew Arnold & Popular Education in England. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1970.

■ Willey, Basil. Nineteenth Century Studies: Coleridge to Matthew Arnold. London: Chatto & Windus, 1964 (1st pub. 1949).

■ Williams, Raymond. Culture and Society 1780-1950. Middlesex: Penguin, 1977 (1st pub. 1958).

Woolf, Leonard. After the Deluge: A Study of Communal Psychology. vol. I, pp.281-288. London: The Hogarth Press, 1931.

III) Articles

■ Anderson, Warren. "Matthew Arnold and the Grounds of Comparatism." Comparative Literature Studies 8, No. 4 (Dec. 1971):287-302.

Babbitt, Irving. "Matthew Arnold." pp. 48-65 of Spanish Character and Other Essays. Boston and New York: Houghton Mifflin, 1940.

Bachem, Rose. "Pioneers of Comparative Literature in the 19th Century." Revue de Littérature Comparée 42, No. 4 (Oct./Dec. 1968):596-602.

Bantock, G.H. "Matthew Arnold and Education." The Journal of Education 87, No. 1035 (Oct. 1955):443-446.

------. "Matthew Arnold, H.M.I." pp. 86-105 of Freedom and Authority in Education. London: Faber and Faber, 1970. (1st pub. 1952).

■ ------. "The Best Self: Matthew Arnold." pp. 199-221 of The Minds and the Masses 1760-1980. vol. 2 of Studies in the History of Educational Theory. London: George Allen and Unwin, 1984.

Butterfield, P.H. "Aspects of the Work of Matthew Arnold for Royal Commissions." British Journal of Educational Studies. 15 (1967):284-291.

Carnall, Geoffrey. "Matthew Arnold's 'Great Critical Effort.'" Essays in Criticism 8, No. 3 (July 1958):256-268.

Cherry, Douglas. "The Two Cultures of Matthew Arnold and T.H. Huxley." Wascana Review 1, No. 1 (1966):53-61.

Coulling, Sidney M.B. "The Evolution of 'Culture and Anarchy.'" Studies in Philology 60, No. 3 (July 1963):637-668.

Frierson, J.W. "Matthew Arnold, philosophe." Studies on Voltaire and the Eighteenth Century 25 (1963):645-656.

Fuller, Roy. "Philistines and Jacobins." The Sewanee Review. 77, No. 4 (Autumn 1969):692-706.

■ Hans, Nicholas. "English Pioneers of Comparative Education." British Journal of Educational Studies. 1, No. 1 (Nov. 1952):56-59.

Honan, Park. "Fox How and the Continent: Matthew Arnold's Path to the European Sentimental School and 'La Passion Réfléchissante.'" Victorian Poetry 16, Nos. 1 and 2 (Spring/Summer 1978):58-69.

■ Hopkinson, David. "Matthew Arnold's School Inspections, Parts 1 and 2." History Today 29 (Jan. and Feb. 1979):29-37; 98-105.

Hopkinson, David. "The Arnolds and Elementary Education." The Arnoldian. 9, No. 2 (Spring 1982):23-31.

James, Henry. "Matthew Arnold." English Illustrated Magazine (Jan. 1884); reprinted in Literary Reviews and Essays by Henry James. ed. Albert Mordell. New Haven, Conn.: College and University Press, 1957.

Jones, Howard Mumford. "Arnold, Aristocracy and America." The American Historical Review 43, No. 3 (April 1944):393-409.

Jump, J.D. "Matthew Arnold." From Dickens to Hardy. ed. Boris Ford. vol. 6 of The New Pelican Guide to English Literature. Middlesex: Penguin Books, 1982.

■ Keating, P.J. "Arnold's Social and Political Thought." in Matthew Arnold: Writers and their Background. ed. Kenneth Allott. London: G. Bell and Sons, 1975.

Lefcowitz, Allan B., and Mazzeno, Laurence W. "Matthew Arnold and James Bryce." The Arnoldian 10, No. 1 (Winter 1982):29-41.

LeRoy, Gaylord C. "Ambivalence in Matthew Arnold's Prose Criticism." *College English* 13, No. 8 (May 1952):432-438.

Lubell, Albert J. "Matthew Arnold: Between Two Worlds." *Modern Language Quarterly* 22, No. 3 (Sept. 1961):248-263.

Malder, Francine B. "Matthew Arnold and the Idea of Progress." *Centennial Review* 19, No. 4 (Fall 1975):232-248.

Mason, D.M. "Matthew Arnold and Elementary Education: a Reconsideration." *History of Education* 12, No. 3 (1983):177-189.

Moyer, Charles R. "The Idea of History in Thomas and Matthew Arnold." *Modern Philology* 67, No. 2 (Nov. 1969):160-167.

Mulhauser, Frederick L. "Introduction" to Matthew Arnold. *Selected Poetry and Prose*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1953.

Nash, Paul. Review in *Comparative Education Review* 8, No. 2 (Oct. 1964):242-243 of Patrick J. McCarthy. *Matthew Arnold and the Three Classes*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1964; W.F. Connell. *The Educational Thought and Influence of Matthew Arnold*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1950; R.H. Super, ed. *Matthew Arnold: Democratic Education*. Ann Arbor: Univ. of Michigan Press, 1962; R.H. Super, ed. *Matthew Arnold: Schools and Universities on the Continent*. Ann Arbor: Univ. of Michigan Press, 1964.

Pattison, B. "Matthew Arnold." *Pioneers of English Education*. ed. A.V. Judges. London: Faber and Faber 1952.

Raleigh, Walter. "Matthew Arnold." *Some Authors*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1923.

Sheppard, R. "Two Liberals: A Comparison of the Humanism of Matthew Arnold and Wilhelm Von Humboldt." *German Life and Letters*. n.s. 24, No.3 (April 1971):219-234.

Smith, Basil A. "Matthew Arnold: 'The Dandy Isaiah.'" *Modern Age* 1, No. 2 (Fall 1957):184-193.

■ Straumann, Heinrich. "Matthew Arnold and the Continental Idea." *The English Mind: Studies in the English Moralists Presented to Basil Willey*. Cambridge: Cambridge at the University Press, 1964, pp. 240-256.

Trilling, Lionel. "On the Modern Element in Modern Literature." *Varieties of Literary Experience*. ed. Stanley Burnshaw. New York: New York University Press, 1962.

Vogeler, Martha Salmon. "Matthew Arnold and Frederic Harrison: The Prophet of Culture and the Prophet of Positivism." *Studies in English Literature 1500-1900* 2, No. 4 (Autumn 1962):441-462.

■ Walcott, Fred G. "Matthew Arnold and the Curriculum." *Educational Theory* 6, No. 1 (Jan. 1956):74ff.

Watson. George. "Arnold and the Victorian Mind." *Review of English Literature* 8, No. 3 (July 1967):33-45.

Wilson, J. Dover. "Matthew Arnold and the Educationists," pp. 165-193 of *The Social and Political Ideas of Some Representative Thinkers of the Victorian Age*. ed. by F.J.C. Hearnshaw London: Harrap and Co., 1933.